

Ahmednagar Jilha Maratha Vidya Prasarak Samaj's

NEW LAW COLLEGE, AHMEDNAGAR

Subject : Sociology, Paper Name – Theoretical Perspectives in
Sociology (204)

Class : B.A.LL.B.I (Semester Ist) Pattern – 2017

Name of Teacher : Anuradha Sahebrao Jadhav (M.A. NET)

Index

MODULE NO.	PARTICULARS	PAGE NO.
1.	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1. Significance and importance of Theory</p> <p>2. Enlightenment-The Social, economic and political forces</p> <p>3.The French and Industrial Revolutions in the development of sociological thought.</p> <p>4. Indian movement and their contribution for the development of sociology in India.</p>	4-13
2.	<p>Schools of sociological Theory and content of Theories an Overview:</p> <p>1.Significance of Theories and their relationship to law</p> <p>2. Schools of sociological theories- Functionalism, Conflict School, Social action perspective.</p>	14-24
3.	<p>Significant western sociological Thinkers</p> <p>1. August Comte – Positivism – Impact of science on society.</p> <p>2. Herbert Spencer –Social Darwinism – super – organic evolution</p> <p>3. Emil Durkheim –Social Solidarity – Social structure and individuals action and Social Relations.</p> <p>4.Karl Marks – Dialectical and Historical Materialism – Class and class conflict –importance of labour in production</p> <p>5. Max Weber – Power – Authority – Legitimacy and the concept of ideal type – connection between culture and economy.</p>	25-43
4.	<p>Module 04-Significant Indian Social Thinkers:</p> <p>1. Andre Beteille – Religion and Secularism- Caste- Class –Link between poverty and inequality- Role of Institutions.</p> <p>2. M. N. Srinivas- Caste system –Social Stratification.</p> <p>3. Gail Omvedt- anti-cast movements-environmental movements – farmers and women’s movements.</p>	44-52

	5.Ashish Nandey – Culture of Knowledge- Psychology of violence	
5.	Social Dominance Theory: 1.Psychology of Dominance – Circulation of Oppression- Oppression and Cooperation. 2. Theoretical and practical issues of psychological Dominance in Indian Context.	53-60
	References	61

Module No -1

Introduction

1. Significance and importance of Theory
2. Enlightenment-The Social, economic and political forces
3. The French and Industrial Revolutions in the development of sociological thought.
4. Indian movement and their contribution for the development of sociology in India.

1. Significance and Importance of Theory.

Introduction -

Sociological theories are theories of great scope and ambition that either was created in Europe between the early 1800s and the early 1900s or have their roots in the culture of that period. The work of such classical sociological theorists as Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Georg Simmel, and Vilfredo Pareto was important in its time and played a central role in the subsequent development of sociology. Additionally, the ideas of these theorists continue to be relevant to sociological theory today, because contemporary sociologists read them. They have become classics because they have a wide range of application and deal with centrally important social issues. A sociological theory is a set of ideas that provides an explanation for human society. Theories are selective in terms of their priorities and perspectives and the data they define as significant. As a result they provide a particular and partial view of reality. Sociological theories can be grouped together according to a variety of criteria. The most important of these is the distinction between Structural and Social action theories. Structural or macro perspectives analyses the way society as a whole fits together. Theory is set of ideas, which provides logical explanation of facts, findings and relationship, interaction and natural laws by theories access.

Definitions:

- * A theory is a fundamental belief about the world works.
- * A theory is a set of abstract, general, logically related statements

Formulated to explain phenomena in the natural world.

* A theory is a set of ideas, which provides an explanation for something.

- **Significance of Theory :**

A theory is a proposed relationship between two or more concepts. In sociology, theories are statements of reason why particular facts about the social world are related. The scope of the social issues in question may range from exact descriptions of a single process to examples or models for analysis and interpretation. Some theories attempt to tell us about the possible outcome of future events in the social world, while others function as broad perspective which guides further sociological analyses. The importance of theory in the area of sociology cannot be overemphasized. Theories such as the social conflict theory, structural functionalism theory, positivism theory, field theory, rational choice theory, and so on, were developed to explain social phenomena. Sociology is an examination of human beings in social contexts. It entails observing how people in specific communities interact, and surveying and conducting experiments to yield new data on which to build sociological knowledge. Interconnectivity or interdependence is the main characteristic of a society. Sociological theories are frameworks explaining how certain aspects or elements of society are interconnected to the larger processes or environment. Application of theories helps determine the interdependent aspects of the coexistence of individuals or groups. Theories in the area of sociology will help people understand how society works and how they can be a useful part in it. Furthermore, theories helps in decision making with regards to factors affecting a certain community as wrong decisions often result from inadequate knowledge of the structure and other peculiarities of the society. These wrong decisions may have a far-reaching impact on people's lives. In addition, addressing societal problems such as alcoholism, high criminal rate, requires decision makers to have a fair knowledge of the problems and their root causes. Vassos, while contributing to the subject, stated that sociological theories provide insights on social issues, thereby enabling appropriate relevant authority to adequately and effectively tackle the problems. Sociologists focus on how a society is structured, how each and every individual works as part of the whole, how society has changed over the years and predictions of future changes. In essence, sociological theories help people understand society and knowledge of the world as it grows.

Some important points on the significance theory are as follows,

- * It provides information about present social scene.
- * Throws light on social problems.
- * It helps to solve social problem.
- * It helps to common people also.
- * Sociologist theory has lesson to teach.
- * Sociological theory influences our life, our thought, values and Idealist.
- * The unfading influences of old thoughts.
- * Old social thoughts may give rise to new ones.

● **Importance of Theory :**

Sociology is the study of society as a whole, certain elements of the society, such as the family unit and religion, and the evolution of social structures. Sociologists collect various data, such as demographic statistics or personal observations, and determine general explanations of social phenomena. These explanations are called sociological theories and are highly important both in social studies and in everyday life. Understanding Society

Just like chemistry tests information about the composition of chemical elements and physics explains how magnets work, sociological theories have a distinct contribution to human knowledge. Sociologists focus on how a society is structured, how each and every individual works as part of the whole, how society has changed over the years and predictions of future changes. In other words, sociological theories help people understand society and knowledge of the world as it grows. Decision Making It is not possible to make decisions affecting a certain community without deep knowledge of its structure, as miscalculated decisions can have a severe impact on people's lives. Tackling a problem, such as high criminal rates, binge drinking and social segregation, requires decision makers to know what exactly the problem is and its causes. Sociological theories provide an insight on such issues, making it easier and safer for elected representatives to find solutions to social problems. Civic Competence According to the National Council for the Social Studies, the primary purpose of social studies is to promote civic competence. This means that through social studies, students get to learn how to make informed and rational decisions on every issue,

from participating in elections to settling disputes with their neighbors. Sociological theories, which are part of the social studies curriculum, help students to understand how society works and how they can be a useful part. Determining Interdependent Aspects An element characterizing society is interdependence. Individuals or organizations cannot survive independently, while even seemingly dissimilar concepts, such as religion and the rise of an economic system, can be closely connected, as Max Weber suggested in "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism." According to professor Craig Calhoun, sociological theories are frameworks explaining how specific aspects of society are linked to larger processes.

2. Enlightenment – The social, economic and political forces.

Enlightenment of 18th century was an extension of the scientific revolution in which rational thought and reason was extended from nature to society. Thinkers of the Enlightenment, known as philosophers, completely rejected the supremacy of religion, superstition and Church authority and replaced it with reason. Enlightenment synthesized Greek inclination on rational thinking, Stoic emphasis on natural law and Christen idea of equality of man. Enlightenment thus had a profound impact on the social and economic thinking of that time. The thinkers of enlightenment shattered the influence of superstition, revelations and priestly authority and emphasized the importance of human intelligence and rational thinking. In their writings, philosophers urged to break the shackles of tradition. In the words of Immanuel Kant, "Enlightenment is man's leaving his self caused immaturity". Thinkers of this era argued that reason alone is sufficient to reform societies. They criticized intolerance and inequality in the society. John Locke, one of principle figures of Enlightenment, advocated for religious tolerance, human equality and liberty. His ideas on government, law and liberty inspired the reformers of French revolution. Across the Atlantic, Locke's ideas influenced the founding father of the United States of America. The American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights all reflect the ideals of Enlightenment such as all men are created equal and possess inalienable rights of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. The age of Enlightenment also had a profound effect on the economy. Ideas of free trade or laissez faire were first propagated in this period. As people moved from rural areas to cities, economic reliance shifted from agriculture to non-agricultural products. Life style began to change. A new breed of middle class merchants and trader flourished. This transformation led to economic globalization of Europe. Although

most of the thinkers of Enlightenment were deists and believed in one God, they denounced religious mysteries, miracles and prophecies. Some took a more extreme approach and denied the existence of God and attributed the notion to human ignorance, superstition and fear. Philosophers also stressed the importance of practical knowledge and education to promote human happiness and control over environment. They refused to dwell on insoluble metaphysical issues irrelevant to human condition and proposed pragmatic studies. The thinkers of Enlightenment also denounced slavery and slave trade. They argued that slavery violates the fundamental principles of justice and equality. Enlightenment thus played a pivotal role in transforming social, political, religious and economic life in Europe. Established authority of Church was displaced with that of reason and efforts were directed to improving the state of people.

The Enlightenment, also known as Age of Reason, was a cultural movement that spread through England, France, Germany, and other parts of Europe. The Enlightenment mainly focused on mathematics, science, art, philosophy, politics and literature in the 1700s. This movement took away the fear of the world and the medieval views that were placed upon the people for so many years, and it also opened their eyes to new ideas and reason. Old beliefs such as French monarchy (the privileges that were given to the French nobility) political power, and the authority of the Catholic Church were torn down. They were replaced by political and social orders that followed along the ideas of freedom and equality that came from this period. The Enlightenment's main purpose was to reform society using reason instead of tradition. The Enlightenment started after the scientific revolution in the 1500s and was effected by many events that shaped it into what we now look back to. There were many aspects of the enlightenment that can be broken down into three key factors that contributed to this movement: Political, Economical and Social. Political covers the transition from a monarchy to a political order, as well as the three political revolutions. Economical covers the export and import of trade in Europe, and social deals with the art, theatre, music and cultural parts of the movement. The Enlightenment is best identified by its political accomplishments and outcomes. This movement was marked by three political revolutions, which all helped lay the foundation for modern republican and constitutional democracy. The first revolution was the English Revolution which took place in 1688.

3. The French and Industrial Revolutions in the development of sociological thought.

Impact of Revolutions on Sociology

The beginning of tradition of social sciences has been one of the major developments of the 19th century. It is often said that social sciences are mostly understood as responses to the problem of order that was created in men's minds by the weakening of the old order under the blows of French Revolution and Industrial Revolution. The European society was hard hit by these revolutions. The old order that rested on kinship, land, social class, religion, local community and monarchy became very shaky. Thinkers were more concerned about finding ways and means of reconsolidating these elements of social order. Hence the history of 19th century politics, industry and trade is basically about the practical efforts of human beings to Reconsolidate these elements. The history of 19th century meant new contents and meaning to the doctrine of sociology. A new wave of intellectual and philosophical thoughts was let loose in Europe. Intellectual currents in the form of socio-political ideologies were also witnessed. The ideologies of individualism, socialism, utilitarianism, and utopianism took birth. Thinkers and intellectuals floated new ideologies and spread novel ideas. The Bearings of World Revolutions on Origin and Growth of Sociology American war of Independence gave way to establishment of democracy in American society. Tocquaville in his book Democracy in America advocated that the growth of democracy was instrumental for the development of capitalism in America. C Wright Mills advocated that democracy is different from socialism because it reproduces the elements of an open society whereas socialism develops closed features. All these contributions necessarily indicate how the appearance of democracy in America was considered as an ideal form of governance system. Thus different notions of the world abandoning their traditional system of administration went for democracy, bureaucracy contributing for complete transformation in their structural character. The American War of Independence enormously contributed to the social changes a major area of interest of sociology. Thus it is inevitable to establish interconnectivity between American War of Independence and growth of sociology. French revolution has important bearings on growth and development of sociology. When social history looks into the reasons behind French Revolution, ideological support the revolution received from the intellectuals, middle class and lower clergy and the consequence of French revolution to its contrast, sociology looks for the ideology glorified during the revolution period offering an

intellectual foundation to the growth of sociology. French revolution and Rousseau are synonymous to each other. Rousseau was a liberal and radical as well who believed that man is rational therefore he has capacity of establishing interlink age between individual will and collective will from out of which develops general will establishing organic interlink ages between individual and society. He further believes that man when driven by self-love there is a possibility of emergence of crisis in society. Therefore his self-love will be so designed that it corresponds with sympathy giving rise to harmonic union between individual and society. This argument of Rousseau is foundation to sociology of Comte and exclusively sociology of Durkheim. Hence it can be concluded that Rousseau's theory of general will, his explanation of equality, liberty and man as a moral savage living happily in the state of nature and inequalities as social evils directly influenced the writings of Karl Marx and Durkheim who are two founding pillars of sociology. Hence French Revolution offered an ideological support for the origin and development of sociology. Industrial Revolution was greatly instrumental in transforming the structural character of a small community focused preliterate simple society into a diversified, technologically complex occupationally divergent highly populous modern society. Social change was driven by economic growth and industry gave rise to mass production, appropriation of surplus, profitability, class structure, growth of markets, impersonal relations between people, growing importance on laws and comprehensive change in social relationships, economic structure and interpersonal relationships between individuals. A shift from simple to complex society was considered as a disaster by the conservatives who believed that future is dark; there is no source for solace in modern society, decline of religion has given rise to moral crisis therefore purpose of life is lost. For eternal happiness man must have to get back to past. This argument developed by Mastaire and Bonald is still having profound appeal in contemporary sociology. However this conservative reaction is dismissed by rational scholars like J.S Mills who advocates that man is rational enough to distinguish between quantitative and qualitative happiness. Using their rational mind collectively can decide in which direction the society must have to move. They give importance on liberal education, free thinking, scientific temper, the notion of collective justice and importance of law to regulate human action driving him in the direction of progress and development. Freedom to man and to his action is also emphasized by Classical Economists who advocated that man and society work together in a rational manner for the economic development of society and individuals. Thus in conclusion it can be advocated that sociology is able to establish a balance between theories and facts successfully using scientific methods to study social actions, its outcomes such as social institutions and social

groups which are subjected to both continuity and change. The sociologists are using different theoretical paradigms and ideological support they have been receiving from world revolutions and renaissance. Thus it will be impossible to think about the origin of sociology in isolation to economic changes, political transformation and ideological changes that western European societies witnessed from 14th to 19th centuries. Sociology no doubt emerged as a reaction to various revolutions such as technological, social, cultural, moral, spiritual and ideological.

4. Indian Movements and their contribution for the development of sociology in India.

Sociology as a discipline emerged as the contributions made by social thinkers, philosophers, administrators who worked at understanding the Indian society. The contributions made by the Ideologists such as Henry Maine, Alfred Lyell etc. helped in the development of sociology in India. They emphasized the need to preserve the indigenous social institutions found in Indian society rather than destroying them and imposing the alien way of life on the people. They recognized the past glory of Indian cultural and literary traditions. There were also British administrators who made extensive study of Indian people, their races and culture. Most of these studies helped generate a body of knowledge preserved in the Census reports, Imperial Gazetteers, District Gazetteers etc. as well as in the books and monographs used by the sociologists and social anthropologists extensively. Alongside of sociology anthropology was also developing in Indian universities. In the Indian context it is not possible to distinguish between anthropology and sociology except in terms of methodology. Sociology has studied urban industrial groups while anthropology focused on tribes, castes and communities. In the Indian academic studies find that tribe, caste and region have been linked with each other in variety of ways. Both sociology and anthropology in India are mainly based on empirical data. They deal with aggregates of people in a number of locales, village, town and city.

During British rule a number of ethnographic works were written by J H Hutton, Edwards Thurston, Risley and others. There were also writings of Sir Henry Maine and Baden Powell on the village community in India. In India the religions did not place a on freethinking. The stimulus to creative work in the Indian social science came from interaction with the west. The emergence and development of sociology and anthropology was influenced by the of nationalism in India. The nationalist movement was itself a product of the impact of the west especially colonial rule in India. The repercussion of this impact

was felt widely due to several reasons such as improvement in communication, transport facilities and printing press etc. Modern law and western education generated a new self-awareness in Indian people. The awareness of people along the lines of religion, sects, caste, tribes etc. became more heightened on the one hand while a wider level a new sense of unity emerged. All these social changes gave rise to new problems. In 1769 Henry Verelst the Governor of Bengal and Bihar stressed in his directives to revenue supervisors the need for collecting information about the leading families and their customs. Besides the officials, the missionaries too recorded valuable data about the society of that period. In 1817 the first all “ India census was undertaken by the British government. In 1901 Sir Risley attempted to establish an ethnographic survey of India that was part of the census. The census data became an instrument of official policy. It became a method of creating barriers between Hindus and other groups like tribes between the various castes and so on. The British began recording the scheduled castes as distinct from the other Hindu castes as a policy. B N Seal a professor of Philosophy at Calcutta University was one of the first scholars to draw the attention of the university towards sociology. He was actively involved in refuting the unilinear evolutionary doctrines, which believed that like an organism society has evolved from a simple primitive stage to more complex industrial stage. Indian society like several others in its various aspects represented the lower rungs of a ladder. The 20th century European civilization represented the highest point of this ladder. This was an ethnocentric belief of European scholars who believed that their society was the best and most evolved while the rest of the world was in various stages of evolution. Seal rejected this view and wrote and lectured extensively in defence of Indian culture throughout his Comparative Sociology. He was responsible for introducing sociology in Calcutta University and later Mysore University. In Bombay Patrick Geddes was responsible for the introduction of sociology. He opened department in 1919 that was a landmark in the development of sociology in India. Le Play an eminent sociology influenced Geddes. Geddes was interested in human geography and town planning with specific interest in the problems of urban deterioration. He studied the town planning of such cities as Calcutta; Indore etc. that are of great value. G.S Ghurye, Radhakamal Mukherjee show the influence of Geddes in their sociological writings. The others who firmly established sociology in India are D N Majumdar and N.K Bose. D.N. Majumdar of Lucknow University was trained in anthropology. He worked extensively in both the anthropological field as well in social anthropology. He studied the races, tribes and cultures in various regions in India. His specific interest was in the study of problem of culture changes and adaptation of tribes and their social problems.

K Bose made a very significant contribution to the development of sociology in India. He was a political and social activist who was a director of the Anthropological Survey of India from 1959-64 and from 1967-70 held the office of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the Government of India. His contributions were basically in the study of Indian civilization and culture. His best work is believed to be the Hindu Samajer Garhan that is in Bengali. Irawati Karve extensively used the indological literature in her sociological writings. She was the student of GS Ghurye and did extensive fieldwork in various regions of India. Her knowledge of Sanskrit helped her in understanding ancient literature like scriptures, law books and epics. She used this data to understand the kinship organization in India. Her book Kinship organization in India is one of the best analyses of kinship system found in India. She has divided India into four zones and attempted their comparison. The work starts with the genealogies of the characters in the Hindu epic Mahabharata and incorporates field notes from different parts of India. She combined her interest in the study of classics with field studies. Irawati Karve's initial work was on the anthropometric measurements of various groups in Maharashtra. She distinguished social groups by their linguistic affiliations and was able to trace origins of different people following the same occupation and found how some of their groups were exogamous and formed castes. On the other hand their cluster of occupation based castes was a joining together of such castes. Irawati Karve was hailed as the first feminist sociologist of India.

Module 02

Schools of sociological Theory and content of Theories an Overview

1. Significance of Theories and their relationship to law
2. Schools of sociological theories- Functionalism, Conflict School, Social action perspective.

1. Significance of Theories and their relationship to Law

Introduction :

Among the social sciences, sociological theories stand out among the most developed Analytical perspectives that contemplate the role of law in society. Not only is sociology unique in offering theoretical perspectives on the place and transformation of the institution of law relative to the whole of society, it is also the case that sociologists have offered many of the important intellectual building blocks of other social theories of law. The two most central founders of sociology, Max Weber (1864-1920) and Émile Durkheim (1858-1917), developed elaborate theories of law without which no social theory of law today would be possible. In the further maturation of the sociological discipline, theoretical interest in the study of law waxed and waned. Consistent in the sociological study of law, however, has been a systematic focus on the societal characteristics of law based on general theoretical models. Classical Sociology the sociological classics contributed to the theoretical study of law by offering systematic accounts of the changing role of law in the rapidly changing societies at the dawn of the twentieth century. In France, Émile Durkheim contemplated the role of law in securing integration in a society that is highly industrialized and that is culturally marked by a high degree of individualism. Law was to Durkheim the measurable indicator of a society's morality, which the sociologist analyzes in terms of its causes and functions. Specifically, Durkheim posited a theory of legal change from repressive law to restitutive law. Repressive law reflected the religious traditions of relatively small scale mechanical societies, where any infraction of law, however small, was punished severely. By contrast, the large organic societies of modern times allow for greater individual variation in thought and action, leading law to seek to secure order as well as diversity and allow for restitution and reintegration, should legal norms be broken. Alongside this transformation of

law, Durkheim theorized, professional associations would have to take up some of the integrative functions that once were secured by traditional systems of law. The contributions to law of the German sociologist Max Weber remain among the most developed and systematic in sociology until this day. Even more clearly than Durkheim, Weber positioned the sociology of law in relation to other intellectual perspectives of law. Specifically, Weber defined the sociology of law as the external study of the empirical characteristics of law's role in society. Differentiated from this perspective are the internal study of law, which is undertaken by legal professionals to maintain the consistency of the legal system, and moral perspectives of law, which seek to ground or criticize law based on a normative principle. Weber argued that the theoretical key to the transition from preindustrial to modern law was the specific form of the rationalization of law. According to Weber, modern law is formally rational, meaning that law is based on procedures requiring that it should apply equally and fairly to all. Besides being impartial, modern law is also codified (written down) and impersonal in its procedural reliance exclusively on the facts of the case. Although sociological theories of law could benefit, perhaps more clearly than any other specialty area, from the pioneering work of the discipline's founders, the sociology of law was relatively slow to progress during the first half of the twentieth century. To be sure, several scholars, especially in Europe, took up the challenge to develop theoretical perspectives in the sociological study of law. Eugen Ehrlich (1862-1922), Nicholas Timasheff (1886-1970), Georges Gurvitch (1894-1965) were most notable among those who contributed to the theoretical elucidation of law from a sociological viewpoint. Yet, the works of these scholars have only recently been discussed and have not influenced much research or debate.

- **Schools of sociological theories –
Functionalism, Conflict School, Social Action
Perspective.**

Sociologists analyze social phenomena at different levels and from different perspectives. From concrete interpretations to sweeping generalizations of society and social behaviour, sociologists study everything from specific events to the 'big picture'. The pioneering European sociologists, however, also offered a broad conceptualizations of the fundamentals of society and its workings. Their views form the basis for today's theoretical perspectives, or paradigms, which provide sociologists with an orienting framework

philosophical position for asking certain kinds of questions about society and its people. Sociologists today employ three primary theoretical perspectives : the functionalist perspective, the conflict perspective and social action perspective. These perspectives offer sociologists theoretical paradigms for explaining how society influences people, and vice versa. Each perspective uniquely conceptualizes society, social forces and human behavior.

1) Functionalism :

Functionalism, also called structural functional theory, sees society as a structure with interrelated parts designed to meet the biological and social needs of the individuals in that society. Functionalism grew out of the writings of English philosopher and biologist, Hebert Spence (1820–1903), who saw similarities between society and the human body; he argued that just as the various organs of the body work together to keep the body functioning, the various parts of society work together to keep society functioning. The parts of society that Spence referred to were the social institutions, or patterns of beliefs and behaviors focused on meeting social needs, such as government, education, family, health care, religion, and the economy. Émile Durkheim, another early sociologist, applied Spence's theory to explain how societies change and survive over time. Durkheim believed that society is a complex system of interrelated and interdependent parts that work together to maintain stability (Durkheim 1893), and that society is held together by shared values, languages, and symbols. He believed that to study society, a sociologist must look beyond individuals to social facts such as laws, morals, values, religious beliefs, customs, fashion, and rituals, which all serve to govern social life. Alfred Radcliff Brown(1881–1955) defined the function of any recurrent activity as the part it played in social life as a whole, and therefore the contribution it makes to social stability and continuity (Radcliff Brown 1952). In a healthy society, all parts work together to maintain stability, a state called dynamic equilibrium by later sociologists such as Parsons (1961). Durkheim believed that individuals may make up society, but in order to study society, sociologists have to look beyond individuals to social facts. Social facts are the laws, morals, values, religious beliefs, customs, fashions, rituals, and all of the cultural rules that govern social life (Durkheim 1895). Each of these social facts serves one or more functions within a society. For example, one function of a society's laws may be to protect society from violence, while another is to punish criminal behaviour, while another is to preserve public health. Another noted structural functionalist, Robert Merton (1910–2003), pointed out that social processes often have many functions. Manifest functions are the consequences of a social process that are sought or anticipated, while latent functions are the

unsought consequences of a social process. A manifest function of college education, for example, includes gaining knowledge, preparing for a career, and finding a good job that utilizes that education. Latent functions of your college years include meeting new people, participating in extracurricular activities, or even finding a spouse or partner. Another latent function of education is creating a hierarchy of employment based on the level of education attained. Latent functions can be beneficial, neutral, or harmful. Social processes that have undesirable consequences for the operation of society are called dysfunctions. In education, examples of dysfunction include getting bad grades, truancy, dropping out, not graduating, and not finding suitable employment.

Some sociologists see the social world as a stable and an ongoing unity. They are impressed with the endurance of the family, organized religion, and other social institutions. They define society as a system of interrelated parts that are interdependent. According to them, society is just like the human body. The human body consists of numerous parts like head, heart, limbs etc. and each part has its distinct functions to play in the life of the total organism. Similarly, society has also its distinct parts like family, government, economy, religion, education etc. Functionalism addresses society as a whole in terms of the function of its constituent elements such as norms, customs, traditions, institutions etc. Social structures are stressed and placed at the centre of analysis and social functions are deduced from these structures. The functionalist perspective is based largely on the works of Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parsons, and Robert Merton. According to functionalism, society is a system of interconnected parts that work together in harmony to maintain a state of balance and social equilibrium for the whole. For example, each of the social institutions contributes important functions for society: Family provides a context for reproducing, nurturing, and socializing children; education offers a way to transmit a society's skills, knowledge, and culture to its youth; politics provides a means of governing members of society; economics provides for the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services; and religion provides moral guidance and an outlet for worship of a higher power. The functionalist perspective emphasizes the interconnectedness of society by focusing on how each part influences and is influenced by other parts. For example, the increase in single parent and dual earner families has contributed to the number of children who are failing in school because parents have become less available to supervise their children's homework. As a result of changes in technology, colleges are offering more technical programs, and many adults are returning to school to learn new skills that are required in the workplace. The increasing number of women in the workforce has contributed to the formulation of policies against

sexual harassment and job discrimination. Functionalism interprets each part of society in terms of how it contributes to the stability of the whole society. Society is more than the sum of its parts; rather, each part of society is functional for the stability of the whole society. The different parts are primarily the institutions of society, each of which is organized to fill different needs and each of which has particular consequences for the form and shape of society. The parts all depend on each other. According to the functionalist perspective of sociology, each aspect of society is interdependent and contributes to society's stability and functioning as a whole. For example, the government provides education for the children of the family, which in turn pays taxes on which the state depends to keep itself running. That is, the family is dependent upon the school to help children grow up to have good jobs so that they can raise and support their own families. In the process, the children become law-abiding, taxpaying citizens, who in turn support the state. If all goes well, the parts of society produce order, stability, and productivity. If all does not go well, the parts of society then must adapt to recapture a new order, stability, and productivity. For example, during a financial decline with its high rates of unemployment and inflation, social programs are trimmed or cut. Schools offer fewer programs. Families tighten their budgets. And a new social order, stability, and productivity occur. Functionalists believe that society is held together by social consensus, in which members of the society agree upon, and work together to achieve, what is best for society as a whole. Structural functionalism, or simply functionalism, is a framework for building theory that sees society as a complex system whose parts work together to promote solidarity and stability. This approach looks at society through a macro level orientation, which is a broad focus on the social structures that shape society as a whole, and believes that society has evolved like organisms. This approach looks at both social structure and social functions. Functionalism addresses society as a whole in terms of the function of its constituent elements; namely norms, customs, and institutions. A common analogy, popularized by Herbert Spencer presents these parts of society as "organs" that work toward the proper functioning of the "body" as a whole. Each part affects the other parts of the system. In the most basic terms, it simply emphasizes "the effort to impute, as rigorously as , to each feature, custom, or practice, its effect on the functioning of a supposedly stable, cohesive system". For Talcott Parsons, "structural functionalism" came to describe a particular stage in the methodological development of social science, rather than a specific school of thought. The structural functionalism approach is a macro sociological analysis, with a broad focus on social structures that shape society as a whole. Functionalism emphasizes the consensus and order that exist in society, focusing on social stability and

shared public values. From this perspective, disorganization in the system, such as deviant behaviour, leads to change because societal components must adjust to achieve stability. When one part of the system is not working or is dysfunctional, it affects all other parts and creates social problems, which leads to social change. Therefore, the sociological intent of Functionalism is found within the institutions and parts of society that operate as a system creating social balance and equilibrium. Functionalism is defined as the parts of society that are structured to maintain social equilibrium or balance. The parts all contribute to the —functional operation of the system in general. If a part of society is not maintaining social homeostasis, it is referred to as dysfunctional. Furthermore, all other parts of society which are connected to this part are likewise dysfunctional. For example, a dysfunctional school system is the outcome of family life. If the family does not support the goals of education, or does not understand the importance of education in our postmodern society, the children will on average not perform well in school. The functionalist perspective achieved its greatest popularity among American sociologists in the 1940s and 1950s. While European functionalists originally focused on explaining the inner workings of social order, American functionalists focused on discovering the functions of human behaviour. Among these American functionalist sociologists is Robert K. Merton, who divided human functions into two types: manifest functions, which are intentional and obvious and latent functions, which are unintentional and not obvious. The manifest function of attending a church or synagogue, for instance, is to worship as part of a religious community, but its latent function may be to help members learn to distinguish personal from institutional values. With common sense, manifest functions become easily apparent. Yet this is not necessarily the case for latent functions, which often demand a sociological approach to be revealed. Functionalists use the terms functional and dysfunctional to describe the effects of social elements on society. Elements of society are functional if they contribute to social stability and dysfunctional if they disrupt social stability. Some aspects of society can be both functional and dysfunctional. For example, crime is dysfunctional in that it is associated with physical violence, loss of property, and fear. But according to Durkheim and other functionalists, crime is also functional for society because it leads to heightened awareness of shared moral bonds and increased social cohesion. Sociologists have identified two types of functions : manifest and latent (Merton 1968). Manifest functions are consequences that are intended and commonly recognized. Latent functions are consequences that are unintended and often hidden. For example, the manifest function of education is to transmit knowledge and skills to society's youth. But public elementary schools also serve as babysitters for employed

parents, and colleges offer a place for young adults to meet potential mates. The babysitting and mate selection functions are not the intended or commonly recognized functions of education; hence they are latent functions. In general social functions have 3 components : Manifest functions, latent functions and dysfunctions. The recognized and intended consequences of any social pattern are its manifest Functions e.g. manifest function of education include preparing for a career by getting good grades, graduation and finding good job etc. Latent functions are the unrecognized and unintended consequences of any social pattern [objective consequences/functions e.g. latent functions of education include meeting new people, participating in extracurricular activities taking school trips or maybe finding a spouse. The concept of latent function extends the observer's attention BEYOND the question of whether or not the behaviour attains its confirmed purpose. Sociological observers are less likely to examine the collateral/latent functions of the behaviour. In the other hand social pattern's undesirable consequences for the operation of the society are considered dysfunction [failure to achieve manifest function] e.g. Dysfunction of education include not getting good grade, not getting a job etc. Functional analysts tend to focus on the statics of social structure and to neglect the study of structural change. Concept of dysfunction implies the concept of strain, stress and tension on the structural level of a social system.

2) *Conflict School :*

Conflict theory looks at society as a competition for limited resources. This perspective is a macro level approach most identified with the writings of German philosopher and sociologist Karl Marx (1818–1883), who saw society as being made up of individuals in different social classes who must compete for social, material, and political resources such as food and housing, employment, education, and leisure time. Social institutions like government, education, and religion reflect this competition in their inherent inequalities and help maintain the unequal social structure. Some individuals and organizations are able to obtain and keep more resources than others, and these “winners” use their power and influence to maintain social institutions. Several theorist suggested variations on this basic theme. Polish Austrian sociologist Ludwig Gumplowicz (1838–1909) expanded on Marx’s ideas by arguing that war and conquest are the basis of civilizations. He believed that cultural and ethnic conflicts led to states being identified and defined by a dominant group that had power over other groups (Irving 2007). German sociologist Max Weber agreed with Marx but also believed that, in addition to economic inequalities, inequalities of political power and

social structure cause conflict. Weber noted that different groups were affected differently based on education, race, and gender, and that people's reactions to inequality were moderated by class differences and rates of social mobility, as well as by perceptions about the legitimacy of those in power. German sociologist Georg Simmel (1858–1918) believed that conflict can help integrate and stabilize a society. He said that the intensity of the conflict varies depending on the emotional involvement of the parties, the degree of solidarity within the opposing groups, and the clarity and limited nature of the goals. Simmel also showed that groups work to create internal solidarity, centralize power, and reduce dissent. Resolving conflicts can reduce tension and hostility and can pave the way for future agreements. In the 1930s and 1940s, German philosophers, known as the Frankfurt School, developed critical theory as an elaboration on Marxist principles. Critical theory is an expansion of conflict theory and is broader than just sociology, including other social sciences and philosophy. A critical theory attempts to address structural issues causing inequality; it must explain what's wrong in current social reality, identify the people who can make changes, and provide practical goals for social transformation (Horkeimer 1982). More recently, inequality based on gender or race has been explained in a similar manner and has identified institutionalized power structures that help to maintain inequality between groups. Janet Saltzman Chafetz (1941–2006) presented a model of feminist theory that attempts to explain the forces that maintain gender inequality as well as a theory of how such a system can be changed (Turner 2003). Similarly, critical race theory grew out of a critical analysis of race and racism from a legal point of view. Critical race theory looks at structural inequality based on white privilege and associated wealth, power, and prestige.

The functionalist perspective views society as composed of different parts working together. In contrast, the conflict perspective views society as composed of different groups and interest competing for power and resources. The conflict perspective explains various aspects of our social world by looking at which groups have power and benefit from a particular social arrangement. For example, feminist theory argues that we live in a patriarchal society—a hierarchical system of organization controlled by men. Although there are many varieties of feminist theory, most would hold that feminism "demands that existing — economic, political, and social structures be changed". Conflict occurs whenever disagreements exist in a social situation over issues or substance and/or emotional antagonism. It deals with the incompatible aspects of the society. According to this perspective change emerges from the crisis between human beings and their society. Human

beings have capacity to think and act against situations that are not satisfactory to their existence. Means of conflict between two classes of people can bring change in society. Society and Conflict Society is created from the ongoing conflict between key groups. According to some theorists, these groups are the main economic classes of — society. These are made up of those who own the main wealth of society, and those who own little but their ability to labour. The main theorist representing this approach is Karl Marx (1818-1883). He saw society as being built out of the conflicting interests of the —owner class and the —working class. In his view, the resulting struggle between classes would lead to a classless society. Every Society is at every point subject to the processes of change. Change is everywhere. Every Element in a society contributes to its disintegration and change. Every Society is based on coercion of some members by others.

3) *Social Action Perspective :*

Introduction :

Max Weber (1864-1920) was one of the founding fathers of Sociology. Weber saw both structural and action approaches as necessary to developing a full understanding of society and social change. In one of his most important works ‘Economy and Society’, first published in the 1920s, he said ‘Sociology is a science concerning itself with interpretive understanding of social action and thereby with a causal explanation of its course and consequences.’ For the purposes of A level Sociology we can reduce Weber’s extensive contribution to Sociology to three things – firstly he argued that ‘Verstehen’ or empathetic understanding is crucial to understanding human action and social change, a point which he emphasised in his classic study ‘The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism’; secondly, he believed we could make generalisations about the basic types of motivation for human action (there are four basic types) and thirdly, he still argued that structure shaped human action, because certain societies or groups encourage certain general types of motivation (but within these general types, there is a lot of variation possible).

Social Action and Verstehen Weber argued that before the cause of an action could be ascertained you had to understand the meaning attached to it by the individual. He distinguished between two types of understanding. First he referred to direct observational understanding, where you just observe what people are doing. For example, it is possible to observe what people are doing – for example, you can observe someone chopping wood, or you can even ascertain (with reasonable certainty) someone’s emotional state from their body

language or facial expression. However, observational understanding alone is not sufficient to explain social action. The second type of understanding is Empathetic Understanding – in which sociologists must try to understand the meaning of an act in terms of the motives that have given rise to it. This type of understanding would require you to find out why someone is chopping wood – Are they doing it because they need the firewood, are they just clearing a forest as part of their job, are they working off anger, just doing it because they enjoy it? To achieve this Weber argued that you had to get into the shoes of people doing the activity.

Weber's Four Types of Action (and types of society) Social action is more important in sociological viewpoint of Weber. Social action is the subject matter of sociology. Max Weber describes the level of sociological action. These different level and type describe the sociological behaviour of human of sociological action. Max Weber divided in following four parts the main type of sociological action:

Traditional Type : These actions are performing by social heritage. Weber says that sociological actions of human are related to tradition and custom in society. Human edits these things because it is continuing from classic and the part of social heritage of human. Every society has some tradition and customs. The control of every society is so hard so we follow the action if we do not want. Example – The tradition of cremation of Hindu are full of different ritualistic. Person is editing these ritualistic if they do not want.

Affective or Emotional Type : Aristotle says that human is a sociological creature, it is correct, but as well as human is also a feeling based creature. Human does not do work always with logic and discretion. He is continue dip in emotion and operated from different type of emotion. He has the feeling of work, anger, fascination, fear, jealousy. When social action performs affected with these emotions of human then it is known as the emotional type of sociological action. These action are not understand by tradition and values or logic and rational, but these actions are understand by A cruel person is also emotional to sew the hungry boy and turn their action in to kindness. It is emotion that many people is weeping to see the one weeping person.

Evaluation Type : The third type of social action of Max Weber is evaluation. These types of sociological actions are related to values. Every society has some certain value and criteria. On the bases of these value and criteria, understand the group. Every society secures their values and criteria. These evaluation actions are come from ancient and continuing in future. These action have own values in society which is not understand by logic and rational. The value of married women is to fill the vermilion. The sociological value is to touch the foot of elders by which person are directed.

Rationalistic Type : The fourth and last type of social action of Max Weber is rationalistic. When any work are performing with planning from rational and logic and involved in this means and end than

these action are known as rationalistic sociological action. Rationalistic actions are more important in comparison to other action. Those actions of human are calls rationalistic actions, which operated on the bases of means and end. When we performed any work then clearly describe the source for find the aim of that work. There is only one aim to editing the arrangement of sociological actions. By this human fulfilling their need. These types of sociological actions are full of logic and scientific. Human uses the suitable source before performing any work, and then he achieves their goal then these actions are called rationalistic. Example addition of 2 and 2 is 4. This is rational. To illustrate these different types of action consider someone “going to school” in terms of these four ideal types: Traditionally, one may attend college because her parents, aunts, and uncles have as well. They wish to continue the family tradition and continue with college as well. When relating to affective, one may go to school just because they enjoy learning. They love going to college whether or not it will make them broke. With value rational, one may attend college because it’s a part of his/her religion that everyone must receive the proper education. Therefore, this person attends college for that reason only. Finally, one may go to college because he/she may want an amazing job in the future and in order to get that job, he/she needs a college degree. Max Weber was particularly interested in the later of these – he believed that modern societies encouraged ‘Instrumental Action’ – that is we are encouraged to do things in the most efficient way (e.g. driving to work) rather than thinking about whether driving to work is the right thing to do (which would be value rational action. Weber believed that modern societies were obsessed with efficiency – modernizing and getting things done, such that questions of ethics, affection and tradition were brushed to one side – this has the consequence of making people miserable and leading to enormous social problems. Weber was actually very depressed about this and had a mental breakdown towards the end of his life.

Module 03

Significant Western Sociological Thinkers

1. August Comte- Positivism Impact of Science on Society.
2. Herbert Spencer- Social Darwinism; Super-organic evolution
3. Emil Durkheim- Social solidarity- Social Structure and Individuals actions
Social relations.
4. Karl Marks Dialectic and Historical Materialism- Class and Class.
Conflicts Importance of labour in production.
5. Max Weber- Power Authority and Legitimacy and the concept of Ideal
Type- Connection between culture and economy.

1. Auguste Comte

- *Positivism Impact of Science on Society*

Auguste Comte (1798 – 1857) was a French positivist thinker and came up with the term of sociology to name the new science made by Saint Simon. One universal law that Comte saw at work in all sciences he called the 'law of three phases'. It is by his statement of this law that he is best known in the English speaking world; namely, that society has gone through three phases: Theological, Metaphysical, and Scientific. He also gave the name "Positive" to the last of these because of the polysemous connotations of the word. The Theological phase was seen from the perspective of 19th century France as preceding the Enlightenment, in which man's place in society and society's restrictions upon man were referenced to God. By the "Metaphysical" phase, he was not referring to the Metaphysics of Aristotle or any other ancient Greek philosopher, for Comte was rooted in the problems of French society subsequent to the revolution of 1789. This Metaphysical phase involved the justification of universal rights as being on a vaunted higher plane than the authority of any human ruler to countermand, although said rights were not referenced to the sacred beyond mere metaphor. What he announced by his term of the Scientific phase, which came into being after the failure of the revolution and of Napoleon, was that people could find solutions to social problems and bring them into force despite the proclamations of human rights or prophecy of the will of God. In this regard he was similar to Karl Marx and Jeremy Bentham. For its time,

this idea of a Scientific phase was considered up-to-date, although from a later standpoint it is too derivative of classical physics and academic history. The other universal law he called the 'encyclopaedic law'. By combining these laws, Comte developed a systematic and hierarchical classification of all sciences, including inorganic physics (astronomy, earth science and chemistry) and organic physics (biology and for the first time, physique social, later renamed sociologies). This idea of a special science not the humanities, not meta physics for the social was prominent in the 19th century and not unique to Comte. The ambitious many would say grandiose way that Comte conceived of it, however, was unique. Comte saw this new science, sociology, as the last and greatest of all sciences, one that would include all other sciences, and which would integrate and relate their findings into a cohesive whole. Comte's explanation of the Positive philosophy introduced the important relationship between theory, practice and human understanding of the world. On page 27 of the 1855 printing of Harriet Martineau's translation of *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte*, we see his observation that, "If it is true that every theory must be based upon observed facts, it is equally true that facts can not be observed without the guidance of some theory. Without such guidance, our facts would be desultory and fruitless; we could not retain them: for the most part we could not even perceive them. He coined the word "altruism" to refer to what he believed to be a moral obligations of individuals to serve others and place their interests above one's own. He opposed the idea of individual rights, maintaining that they were not consistent with this supposed ethical obligation (Catechism Positivist). Comte formulated the law of three stages, one of the first theories of the social evolutionism: that human development (social progress) progresses from the theological stage, in which nature was mythically conceived and man sought the explanation of natural phenomena from supernatural beings, through metaphysical stage in which nature was conceived of as a result of obscure forces and man sought the explanation of natural phenomena from them until the final positive stage in which all abstract and obscure forces are discarded, and natural phenomena are explained by their constant relationship. This progress is forced through the development of human mind, and increasing application of thought, reasoning and logic to the understanding of world. During his lifetime, Comte's work was sometimes viewed sceptically because he elevated Positivism to a religion and named himself the Pope of Positivism. Comte coined the term "sociology", and is usually regarded as the first sociologist. His emphasis on the interconnectedness of different social elements was a forerunner of modern functionalism. Nevertheless, like many others from his time, certain elements of his work are regarded as eccentric and unscientific, and his grand vision of

sociology as the centrepiece of all the sciences has not come to fruition. His emphasis on a quantitative, mathematical basis for decision-making remains with us today. It is a foundation of the modern notion of Positivism, modern quantitative statistical analysis, and business decision-making.

2. Herbert Spencer – Social Darwinism; Super organic

Evolution

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) was an English philosopher and prominent liberal political theorist. Although today he is chiefly remembered as the father of Social Darwinism, a school of thought that applied the evolutionist theory of survival of the fittest (a phrase coined by Spencer) to human societies, he also contributed to a wide range of subjects, including ethics, metaphysics, religion, politics, rhetoric, biology and psychology. Although he has often been criticized as a perfect example of scientism, he was at the time considered by many to be one of the most brilliant men of his generation. The early works of Spencer demonstrated a liberal view of workers' rights and governmental responsibility. He continued in this vein by developing a rationalist philosophy concerning the natural laws of progress. These views would mature into his 1851 manuscript *Social Statics*, a document that stressed the importance of looking at the long-term effects of social policy with respect to the nature of man. Spencer is often quoted out of context, making him seem uncompassionate toward the poor and working class. In actuality he stressed "positive beneficence" and man's evolving "moral faculty," and was ahead of his time in promoting the rights of women and children. It was here that Spencer began developing his view of civilization, not as an artificial construct of man, but as a natural and organic product of social evolution. Since this "social Darwinism" precedes "The Origin of Species," it would be more accurate to refer to Darwin's ideas as "biological Spencerism." In 1855 Spencer wrote *Principles of Psychology*, which explored a theory of the mind as a biological counterpart of the body rather than as an estranged opposite. In this model human intelligence was something that had slowly developed as a response to its physical environment. In 1862 Spencer was able to publish *First Principles*, an exposition of his evolutionary theory of the underlying principles of all domains of reality, which had acted as the foundational beliefs of his previous works. His definition of evolution explained it as the ongoing process by which matter is refined into an increasingly complex and coherent form. This was the main canon of Spencer's philosophy, a developed and coherently structured explanation of evolution (that predated Darwin's major

works). By this time Spencer was achieving an international reputation of great respect. His views on man's place in nature were very influential and broadly accepted. While he had an interest in all the sciences, Spencer never committed his time to a single field of study and was not an experimentalist. Perhaps this broad range of knowledge and lack of specialization made his views and writing so accessible and popular.

2. Emile Durkheim Social solidarity Social Structure and Individual actions social relations

Emile Durkheim (1858 – 1917) was concerned primarily with how societies could maintain their integrity and coherence in the modern era, when things such as shared religious and ethnic background could no longer be assumed. In order to study social life in modern societies, Durkheim sought to create one of the first scientific approaches to social phenomena. Along with Herbert Spencer, Durkheim was one of the first people to explain the existence and quality of different parts of a society by reference to what function they served in keeping the society healthy and balanced position that would come to be known as functionalism. Durkheim also insisted that society was more than the sum of its parts. Thus unlike his contemporary Max Weber, he focused not on what motivates the actions of individual people (methodological individualism), but rather on the study of social facts, a term which he coined to describe phenomena which have an existence in and of themselves and are not bound to the actions of individuals. He argued that social facts had independent existence and more objective than the actions of the individuals that composed society and could only be explained by other social facts rather than, say, by society's adaptation to a particular climate or ecological niche. In his 1893 work *The Division of Labour in Society*, Durkheim examined how social order was maintained in different types of societies. He focused on the division of labour, and examined how it differed in traditional societies and modern societies. Authors before him such as Herbert Spencer and Ferdinand Toennies had argued that societies evolved much like living organisms, moving from a simple state to a more complex one resembling the workings of complex machines. Durkheim reversed this formula, adding his theory to the growing pool of theories of social progress, social evolutionism and social Darwinism. He argued that traditional societies were 'mechanical' and were held together by the fact that everyone was more or less the same, and hence had things in common. In traditional societies, argues Durkheim, the collective consciousness entirely subsumes individual consciousness social norms are strong and social behaviour is

well regulated. In modern societies, he argued, the highly complex division of labour resulted in 'organic' solidarity. Different specializations in employment and social roles created dependencies that tied people to one another, since people no longer could count on filling all of their needs by themselves. In 'mechanical' societies, for example, subsistence farmers live in communities which are self sufficient and knit together by a common heritage and common job. In modern 'organic' societies, workers earn money, and must rely on other people who specialize in certain products (groceries, clothing, etc.) to meet their needs. The result of increasing division of labour, according to Durkheim, is that individual consciousness emerges distinct from collective consciousness often finding itself in conflict with collective consciousness. Durkheim also made an association of the kind of solidarity in a given society and the preponderance of a law system. He found that in societies with mechanical solidarity the law is generally repressive: the agent of a crime or deviant behaviour would suffer a punishment, that in fact would compensate collective conscience neglected by the crime the punishment acts more to preserve the unity of consciences. On the other hand, in societies with organic solidarity the law is generally recitative: it aims not to punish, but instead to reconstitute normal activity of a complex society. The rapid change in society due to increasing division of labour thus produces a state of confusion with regard to norms and increasing impersonality in social life, leading eventually to relative normlessness, i.e. the breakdown of social norms regulating behaviour; Durkheim labels this state anomie. From a state of anomie come all forms of deviant behaviour, most notably suicide. Durkheim developed the concept of anomie later in *Suicide*, published in 1897. In it, he explores the differing suicide rates among Protestants and Catholics, explaining that stronger social control among Catholics results in lower suicide rates. According to Durkheim, people have a certain level of attachment to their groups, which he calls social integration. Abnormally high or low levels of social integration may result in increased suicide rates; low levels have this effect because low social integration results in disorganized society, causing people to turn to suicide as a last resort, while high levels cause people to kill themselves to avoid becoming burdens on society. According to Durkheim, Catholic society has normal levels of integration while Protestant society has low levels. This work has influenced proponents of control theory, and is often mentioned as a classic sociological study. Finally, Durkheim is remembered for his work on 'primitive' (i.e. non Western) people in books such as his 1912 volume *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* and the essay *Primitive* that he wrote with Marcel Mauss. These works examine the role that religion and mythology have in shaping the worldview and personality of people in extremely (to use Durkheim's phrase)

'mechanical' societies. Durkheim was also very interested in education. Partially this was because he was professionally employed to train teachers, and he used his ability to shape curriculum to further his own goals of having sociology taught as widely possible. More broadly, though, Durkheim was interested in the way that education could be used to provide French citizens the sort of shared, secular background that would be necessary to prevent anomie in modern societies. It was to this end that he also proposed the formation of professional groups to serve as a source of solidarity for adults. Durkheim argued that education has many functions:

1.To reinforce social solidarity History :

Learning about individuals who have done good things for the many makes an individual feel insignificant. Pledging Allegiance : Makes individuals feel part of a group and therefore less likely to break rules.

2. To maintain social roles

School is a society in miniature. It has a similar hierarchy, rules, expectations to the "outside world". It trains young people to fulfil roles.

3.To maintain division of labour.

Sorts students out into skill groups. Teaches students to go into work depending on what they're good at.

1. Karl Marx

- **Dialectic and Historical Materialism Class and Class Conflict Importance Labour in Production**

Karl Marx's (1818-1883) thought was strongly influenced by :

The dialectical method and historical orientation of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel;

The classical political economy of Adam Smith and David Ricardo;

French socialist and sociological thought, in particular the thought of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

The most important concepts of Karl Marx

The following concepts of Marx have aided sociological thought significantly;

Dialectical Materialism

Materialistic Interpretation of History i.e Historical Materialism

Class and Class conflict

Alienation

Marx believed that he could study history and society scientifically and discern tendencies of history and the resulting outcome of social conflicts. Some followers of Marx concluded, therefore, that a communist revolution is inevitable. However, Marx famously asserted in the eleventh of his Theses on Feuerbach that "philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point however is to change it", and he clearly dedicated himself to trying to alter the world. Consequently, most followers of Marx are not fatalists, but activists who believe that revolutionaries must organize social change. Marx's view of history, which came to be called the materialist conception of history (and which was developed further as the philosophy of dialectical materialism) is certainly influenced by Hegel's claim that reality (and history) should be viewed dialectically. Hegel believed that the direction of human history is characterized in the movement from the fragmentary toward the complete and the real (which was also a movement towards greater and greater rationality). Sometimes, Hegel explained, this progressive unfolding of the Absolute involves gradual, evolutionary accretion but at other times requires discontinuous, revolutionary leaps episode upheavals against the existing status quo. For example, Hegel strongly opposed the ancient institution of legal slavery that was practiced in the United States during his lifetime, and he envisioned a time when Christian nations would radically eliminate it from their civilization. While Marx accepted this broad conception of history, Hegel was an idealist, and Marx sought to rewrite dialectics in materialist terms. He wrote that Hegelianism stood the movement of reality on its head, and that it was necessary to set it upon its feet. (Hegel's philosophy remained and remains in direct opposition to Marxism on this key point.) Marx's acceptance of this notion of materialist dialectics which rejected Hegel's idealism was greatly influenced by Ludwig Feuerbach. In *The Essence of Christianity*, Feuerbach argued that God is really a creation of man and that the qualities people attribute to God are really qualities of

humanity. Accordingly, Marx argued that it is the material world that is real and that our ideas of it are consequences, not causes, of the world. Thus, like Hegel and other philosophers, Marx distinguished between appearances and reality. But he did not believe that the material world hides from us the "real" world of the ideal; on the contrary, he thought that historically and socially specific ideologies prevented people from seeing the material conditions of their lives clearly. The other important contribution to Marx's revision of Hegelianism was Engels' book, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* in 1844, which led Marx to conceive of the historical dialectic in terms of class conflict and to see the modern working class as the most progressive force for revolution. The notion of labour is fundamental in Marx's thought. Basically, Marx argued that it is human nature to transform nature, and he calls this process of transformation "labour" and the capacity to transform nature labour power. For Marx, this is a natural capacity for a physical activity, but it is intimately tied to the human mind and human imagination: A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. Karl Marx inherits that Hegelian dialectic and, with it, a disdain for the notion of an underlying invariant human nature. Sometimes Marxists express their views by contrasting "nature" with "history". Sometimes they use the phrase "existence precedes consciousness". The point, in either case, is that who a person is, is determined by where and when he is social context takes precedence over innate behaviour; or, in other words, one of the main features of human nature is adaptability. Marx did not believe that all people worked the same way, or that how one works is entirely personal and individual. Instead, he argued that work is a social activity and that the conditions and forms under and through which people work are socially determined and change over time. Marx's analysis of history is based on his distinction between the means / forces of production, literally those things, such as land, natural resources, and technology, that are necessary for the production of material goods, and the relations of production, in other words, the social and technical relationships people enter into as they acquire and use the means of production. Together these comprise the mode of production; Marx observed that within any given society the mode of production changes, and that European societies had progressed from a feudal mode of production to a capitalist mode of production. In general, Marx believed that the means of production change more rapidly than the relations of production (for example, we develop a new technology, such as the Internet, and only later do we develop laws to regulate that technology). For Marx this

mismatch between (economic) base and (social) superstructure is a major source of social disruption and conflict. Marx understood the "social relations of production" to comprise not only relations among individuals, but between or among groups of people, or classes. As a scientist and materialist, Marx did not understand classes as purely subjective (in other words, groups of people who consciously identified with one another). He sought to define classes in terms of objective criteria, such as their access to resources. For Marx, different classes have divergent interests, which is another source of social disruption and conflict. Conflict between social classes being something which is inherent in all human history: The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Marx was especially concerned with how people relate to that most fundamental resource of all, their own labour power. Marx wrote extensively about this in terms of the problem of alienation. As with the dialectic, Marx began with a Hegelian notion of alienation but developed a more materialist conception. For Marx, the possibility that one may give up ownership of one's own labour one's capacity to transform the world is tantamount to being alienated from one's own nature; it is a spiritual loss. Marx described this loss in terms of commodity fetishism, in which the things that people produce, commodities, appear to have a life and movement of their own to which humans and their behaviour merely adapt. This disguises the fact that the exchange and circulation of commodities really are the product and reflection of social relationships among people. Under capitalism, social relationships of production, such as among workers or between workers and capitalists, are mediated through commodities, including labour, that are bought and sold on the market. Commodity fetishism is an example of what Engels called false consciousness, which is closely related to the understanding of ideology. By ideology they meant ideas that reflect the interests of a particular class at a particular time in history, but which are presented as universal and eternal. Marx and Engels' point was not only that such beliefs are at best half truths; they serve an important political function. Put another way, the control that one class exercises over the means of production includes not only the production of food or manufactured goods; it includes the production of ideas as well (this provides one possible explanation for why members of a subordinate class may hold ideas contrary to their own interests). Thus, while such ideas may be false, they also reveal in coded form some truth about political relations. For example, although the belief that the things people produce are actually more productive than the people who produce them is literally absurd, it does reflect the fact (according to Marx and Engels) that people under capitalism are alienated from their own labour power. Another example of this sort of analysis is Marx's understanding of religion, summed up in a passage from the preface to his

1843 Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. Whereas his Gymnasium senior thesis argued that the primary social function of religion was to promote solidarity, here Marx sees the social function as a way of expressing and coping with social inequality, thereby maintaining the status quo. Marx argued that this alienation of human work (and resulting commodity fetishism) is precisely the defining feature of capitalism. Prior to capitalism, markets existed in Europe where producers and merchants bought and sold commodities. According to Marx, a capitalist mode of production developed in Europe when labour itself became a commodity when peasants became free to sell their own labour power, and needed to do so because they no longer possessed their own land or tools necessary to produce. People sell their labour power when they accept compensation in return for whatever work they do in a given period of time (in other words, they are not selling the product of their labour, but their capacity to work). In return for selling their labour power they receive money, which allows them to survive. Those who must sell their labour power to live are "proletarians." The person who buys the labour power, generally someone who does own the land and technology to produce, is a "capitalist" or "bourgeois." (Marx considered this an objective description of capitalism, distinct from any one of a variety of ideological claims of or about capitalism). The proletarians inevitably outnumber the capitalists. Marx distinguished industrial capitalists from merchant capitalists. Merchants buy goods in one place and sell them in another; more precisely, they buy things in one market and sell them in another. Since the laws of supply and demand operate within given markets, there is often a difference between the price of a commodity in one market and another. Merchants, then, practice arbitrage, and hope to capture the difference between these two markets. According to Marx, capitalists, on the other hand, take advantage of the difference between the labour market and the market for whatever commodity is produced by the capitalist. Marx observed that in practically every successful industry input unit costs are lower than output unit prices. Marx called the difference "surplus value" and argued that this surplus value had its source in surplus labour. The capitalist mode of production is capable of tremendous growth because the capitalist can, and has an incentive to, reinvest profits in new technologies. Marx considered the capitalist class to be the most revolutionary in history, because it constantly revolutionized the means of production. But Marx argued that capitalism was prone to periodic crises. He suggested that over time, capitalists would invest more and more in new

technologies, and less and less in labour. Since Marx believed that surplus value appropriated from labour is the source of profits, he concluded that the rate of profit would fall even as the economy grew. When the rate of profit falls below a certain point, the result would be a recession or depression in which certain sectors of the economy would collapse. Marx understood that during such a crisis the price of labour would also fall, and eventually make possible the investment in new technologies and the growth of new sectors of the economy. Marx believed that this cycle of growth, collapse, and growth would be punctuated by increasingly severe crises. Moreover, he believed that the long term consequence of this process was necessarily the enrichment and empowerment of the capitalist class and the impoverishment of the proletariat. He believed that were the proletariat to seize the means of production, they would encourage social relations that would benefit everyone equally, and a system of production less vulnerable to periodic crises. In general, Marx thought that peaceful negotiation of this problem was impracticable, and that a massive, well organized and violent revolution would in general be required, because the ruling class would not give up power without violence. He theorized that to establish the socialist system, a dictatorship of the proletariat a period where the needs of the working class, not of capital, will be the common deciding factor must be created on a temporary basis. As he wrote in his "Critique of the Gotha Program", "between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." In the 1920s and '30s, a group of dissident Marxists founded the Institute for Social Research in Germany, among them Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, and Herbert Marcuse. As a group, these authors are often called the Frankfurt School. Their work is known as Critical Theory, a type of Marxist philosophy and cultural criticism heavily influenced by Hegel, Freud, Nietzsche, and Max Weber. The Frankfurt School broke with earlier Marxists, including Lenin and Bolshevism in several key ways. First, writing at the time of the ascendance of Stalinism and Fascism, they had grave doubts as to the traditional Marxist concept of proletarian class consciousness. Second, unlike earlier Marxists, especially Lenin, they rejected economic determinism. While highly influential, their work has been criticized by both orthodox Marxists and some Marxists involved in political practice for divorcing Marxist theory from practical struggle and turning Marxism into a purely academic enterprise. Other influential non Bolshevik Marxists at that time include Georg Lukacs, Walter Benjamin and Antonio Gramsci, who along with the Frankfurt School are often known by the term Western Marxism. Henryk Grossman, who elaborated the

mathematical basis of Marx's 'law of capitalist breakdown', was another affiliate of the Frankfurt School. Also prominent during this period was the Polish revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg. In 1949 Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman founded *Monthly Review*, a journal and press, to provide an outlet for Marxist thought in the United States independent of the Communist Party. In 1978, G. A. Cohen attempted to defend Marx's thought as a coherent and scientific theory of history by reconstructing it through the lens of analytic philosophy. This gave birth to Analytical Marxism, an academic movement which also included Jon Elster, Adam Przeworski and John Roemer. Bertell Ollman is another Anglophone champion of Marx within the academy.

2. Max Weber Power Authority and Legitimacy and the concept of Ideal Type connection between culture and economy.

Introduction :

Max Weber was not only a sociologist but also an economist, jurist, historian and a philosopher. He had emphasised on the deep observation, reflection and thought of the social events and life. He had adopted practical outlook towards understanding social events. In short, original attribute of Max Weber was to understand the social events and circumstance on the basis of interpretation. Weber's thought is that we cannot understand social events and circumstance until their rational interpretation is not presented. That is why Max Weber is called the father of interpretative sociology. In the definition of sociology only Weber's thoughts may be understood. As per Weber, "sociology is that science that attempts to make a meaningful (interpretative) realization of social action through which a reasonable interpretation of its (social action) activities and results may be presented." It is clear that the great job that Weber has done it was not possible without a special type of successful scholar. Weber had built life and thought even in the tension of various hostile elements. He has himself written, "If a person is not like an open book then we should not expect his multifaceted personality." Max Weber (1864–1920) was one of the founders of sociology, and he always described himself as a bourgeois theorist. According to Marianne Weber's biography (1926) of her husband, Weber could never have joined a socialist party, as he believed that private companies were the only source of power in society to challenge the state civil service and therefore guarantee freedom and liberty. As Weber himself explained, 'Superior to bureaucracy in the knowledge of techniques and facts is only the capitalist entrepreneur, with his own sphere of interest. He is the only type who has been able to

maintain at least immunity from subjection to the control of rational bureaucratic knowledge'.

Concept of Power :

The starting point for Weber's political analysis was the important distinction between power as authority and power as coercion. For Weber, authority is the legitimate use of power. Individuals accept and act upon orders that are given to them because they believe that to do so is right. In coercion, on the other hand, others force people into an action, often by the threat of violence, and this is always regarded as illegitimate. However, we might wish to question some of the assumptions that Weber made in this area. Weber defined power as the chance that an individual in a social relationship can achieve his or her own will even against the resistance of others. This is a very broad definition and includes a very wide range of types of power. In order to make this definition more useful in the study of history and society, Weber suggests domination as an alternative, or more carefully defined concept. Weber defines domination "as the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) will be obeyed by a given group of persons". Features associated with domination are obedience, interest, belief, and regularity. Weber notes that "every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of voluntary compliance, that is, an *interest* in obedience" (Weber, p. 212). Examples of dominance could include parent child relationships, employee, teacher student, domination within the family, political rule that is generally accepted and obeyed, or the relation between a priest and church member.

That is, a power relation which is one of dominance involves the following :

- 1) Voluntary compliance or obedience. Individuals are not forced to obey, but do so Voluntarily.
- 2) Those who obey do so because they have an interest in so doing, or at least believe that they have such an interest.
- 3) Belief in the legitimacy of the actions of the dominant individual or group is likely (although this is defined by Weber as authority). That is, "the particular claim to legitimacy is to a significant degree and according to its type treated as 'valid'"

4) Compliance or obedience is not haphazard or associated with a short-term Social relationship, but is a sustained relationship of dominance and subordination so that regular patterns of inequality are established. When dominance continues for a considerable period of time, it becomes a structured phenomenon, and the forms of dominance become the social structures of society. Temporary or transient types of power are not usually considered to be dominance. This definition of domination also eliminates those types of power that are based on sheer force, because force may not lead to acceptance of the dominant group or voluntary compliance with its orders. Situations of overt conflict and force are also relatively unusual. For example, Weber considers overt forms of class conflict and class struggle to be uncommon. While Weber's definition of domination may be narrow, it is a useful way of examining relationships that do become structured. While employer employee or other types of relationships characterized by domination and subordination often involve conflict, the use of force is not always, or is not normally, an aspect of these and subordinates do obey and implicitly accept this subordination.

Concept of Authority :

According to Max Weber authority is specially based on economic bases, though economic factors cannot say only factor in selection of authority. In economic life this is clear easily that one side master class tries to increase their authority on the services of labours and sources of production and on other hand the labours try to get maximum rights for their wages in returns of their services. Power is in those hands whose have sources of production and property. Freedom of labour is buying on the bases of this authority and master has special rights upon labour. Though now this type of authority is decreasing day by day and there has been much reduced. But in economic field the sources of production and self property are important factors in the selection of authority for any class. In the field of being institutional to authority the analysis of Weber is in very much in this side. However, Max Weber has been distinct authority in three basic formats. These three types of authority is following:

1. Legal Authority:

Many post are generating according to some ordinary rules predicated by state are such type a on which a specific type of authority is joined. So the people who are sedentary on those post, the authority goes in their hand associated with those post. Example, Mr. Tiwari is authorized to use his power while he is positioned as a judge. It is clear that the source of this

type authority has not contained in self reputation of people, rather he is sedentary on a specific post with in those rules, contained in authority of these rules. So their field is limited to that limit where legal authority is providing specific authority to a person. A person got as authority with in legal rules, that person can not use more authority than that. So there are basic distinction in the field of legal authority and their external field (the field where he live with personal or self status). Example, Mr. Tiwari is officer of offices as the status of judge. These rights are totally different from the authority and rights of Mr. Tiwari as a person (like, as a member of their family). Mr. Tiwari is not a judge, rather a son, father or husband in home. The authority of father and husband is different from the authority of judge.

2. Traditional Authority:

A person gets that authority because of sedentary on approved post by tradition and not because of any scientific rules. Sine this post is defined according to traditional system, so because being sedentary on such post person has to get some authority. These type of authority is called traditional authority being pinned on believes. For example, in agricultural era take the authority of 'jurors' Panchayat at found in Indian villages the authority of these jurors was not come within legal authority; rather they have to get authority in traditional form. Even the comparison of the authority jury from the authority of God, as express in the perception of 'member of panchayat'. Like that in joint family father got those authorities and rights in all subject related with family, his base is also tradition, not legal rights. We are following the all orders of father not because he has any legal right; rather it is because traditionally it is continuing. Legal authority is limited and according to legal rules because legal rules are defined clearly and certainly. in traditional and sociological rules have not certainty. In the status of judge like the authority of Mr. Tiwari there is not any certain limit. In the status of judge where are started the authority of Mr. Tiwari and where are end, it can be says certainly much, but as a father decide the certain limit of Mr. Tiwari is tough.

3. Charismatic Authority:

This authority is not on legal rules or on traditional rules, rather based on some charismatic. Those people have real or imaginary power to see any singularity or trick, they are the officers of these type authorities. A person is take long time to get this type authority and after the enough sources, try and some time advertisement his authority is approved. In other words, a person developed their skills like that (people understand or believed that he developed their skill) and people accept their personal authority. So charismatic leaders are

demanding obedience from others at the name of loyalty for their aim or ideal. There are the ruling person like magician, peer, Avatar, soldiers, religious leader, prophet and minister of any team. People are accepting the authority of like that people these people have some fantastic quality which are not found in ordinary people. So in the heart of every person have a respect for these special quality. These qualities are believed like the quality of divine and God. So the orders are follow the type ruling person with devotion. This type of ruling person express their fantastic power by miracle or victory in war or by other success make believe strong in other people that he is a officer of some special power. There is also not any limit of charismatic authority like traditional authority. But the duration of this authority is limited and it declines such time when ruling person are not show affective display of their fantastic power. And the composition of this authority can be change in traditional side or legal side, so charismatic ruling can be change in traditional authority or legal authority.

Concept of Legitimacy :

The concept of Legitimacy has a close relationship with the concept of Authority. It is the backbone of authority. The effectiveness of authority depends upon the degree of legitimacy behind it. People always want to respect only the legitimate authority. It basically symbolises rightfulness or justness. The term 'Legitimacy' is derived from the Latin word 'Legitimus' which means lawful. The concept of Legitimacy carries different meanings in modern times. It maintains a belief that the existing political system is the most appropriate and the people must regard it as sacred and worthy of respect and obey it unhesitatingly. Various scholars defined the term 'Legitimacy' from different perspectives which help a lot in understanding the meaning of Legitimacy.

Types of Legitimacy

Basically there are two types of legitimacy, namely legitimacy towards authority and legitimacy towards regime. On the basis of sources and objects of legitimacy, David Easton refers to three types of legitimacy which are given below:

Ideological Legitimacy

When the source of legitimacy is the ideology prevailing in the society it is called ideological legitimacy. Every society has its own ideology, values and rules and these form the basis of ideological legitimacy. A political system is also an

articulated source of ideals, ends and purposes which help the members of the system to interpret the past, explain the present and offer a vision of the future. The ideology describes the aims and objects of political system.

Structural Legitimacy

Structural legitimacy is based on an independent belief in the validity of the structure and norms of regime. In any kind of system there are certain structured rules and regulations. Specifically in a democratic form of system the existence of a particular institutional framework (e.g. executive, legislature and judiciary) based on structured rules and regulations is noticed. With the help of a structured legitimate system, the authority holder exercises power over others. Personal Legitimacy: Legitimacy that is based on the personal qualities of the leaders is called personal legitimacy. Many times leaders with their charismatic personalities create a support base among people and thus acquire legitimacy.

Concept of Ideal Type

As already says that until the time of Max Weber a staunch sect was established like that scholar in Germany, which believed on this things that the idea couldn't possible according to the natural science method on social incident. These scholars believed historical of description and clarification in the social field. In this relation Max Weber says that causation relation of social incident cannot clear on logical ways whenever this incident will not divided in some principle level on the basis of last similarity. On doing this we will get some 'Ideal type' incidents for their study. In this viewpoint, it is necessary to reorganized basic the logical structure of social incident. Max Weber developed his famous principle 'Ideal format' in reorganization of this work. Max Weber forced this thing that for establishing his imagination of sociology should be select 'Ideal' perception. 'Ideal Format' is neither 'Average Format' nor Idealism but thoughtful selection of some specific element the 'Actuality' and ideal value made by inclusion. In other words, the mean of 'Ideal Format' is to established accurate perception on the logical bases of tarksangat of some actual facts. 'Ideal' word is not related any type of evaluation. Any scientist can establish the ideal format of any facts or incident for analysis use may be it is related to prostitute or religious minister. The mean of this sentence is not that, "only the prophet or vicious are ideal or they should be follow the ideal method of life." In reality the field of social incident is very detailed and tough. So it is necessary for accuracy and facility in analysis of the incident and study work

that on the basis of similarity some actual incident or humans can be represented with thoughtful and logical manner. The 'Type' is established by these types of selection and inclusion, called 'Ideal Type' or 'Format'. This 'Ideal' is not in this sense that any ideal thought, assumption or method are imitated in their selection and establishment; this ideal is in this sense that it is a specific level or type which represents the reality of these types of activity or whole behavior or whole incident. It is 'Type' very beneficial for scientists and study work are become more accurate. By this 'Type' is ideal for scientists. The word 'Ideal' is used only in this sense not in any one. Max Weber is not claiming to present any new thing for developing the perception 'Ideal Format', he is presenting these more clear and accurate forms from many other social sciences, by which on a logic base the relation of human activities with reason can only be possible. The study and analysis in an arranged manner and more accurate. Max Weber forced on this thing that social scientists should use only those perceptions in work study which is proved, information less and controlled with logical manner. At the sight of scientific method, it is important, because without it scientific analysis and representation of social activity are not possible. There are three main importance of ideal format by Weber separate from the trend perception of natural science.

1) The establishment of this ideal format is possible by the permission of the subject of the action. In other words, in ideal format the mean is subject by the scientific point of view of, it is not more important than action. It is called *Verstehen* in German language. This specialty is clear the difference between social science and natural science. It is true that the perception of Max Weber is taking by Dilthey and Simmel, but he presents it differently from those statements.

2) Ideal format is not the description and analysis of 'Every Thing', it is the social incident and important side representation of subject and so in ideal format some elements are present in their pure form and some are intentionally omitted. By this some uncertainty and ambiguity has not been possible in ideal format and it became more accurate. So Max Weber could not make rigid himself on the principle of their study, but he more forced that ideal format should describe only logical elements of social activity pattern and which is not logically proved or which not suitable in logic point of view; it should be left or thought about it in the form of aware logic. It is signal at the side of specialty and specific quality of ideal format which could be proved helpful to distinguish sociology in the form of a science.

3) Max Weber also attract ours attraction at this side that ideal format should be use in the form of source and instrument only the strong historical problem; to find out the ideal format is not possible the system of any type of stable principle in the field of sociology. But the social problem are different according to situation and the format of these problem is related to the specific viewpoint researcher so for their solution perception or ideal format will not right to believe last.

Module 04

Significant Indian Social Thinkers:

1. Andre Beteille – Religion and Secularism- Caste- Class –Link between poverty and inequality- Role of Institutions.
2. M.N.Srinivas- Caste system –Social Stratification.
3. Gail Omvedt- anti-caste movements-environmental movements –farmers and women’s movements.
4. Ashish Nandey –Culture of Knowledge- Psychology of violence

1. Andre Beteille Religion and Secularism – Caste – Class – Links between Poverty and inequality – Role of Institutions.

Andre Beteille is a Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Delhi School of Economics in University of Delhi. In his long and distinguished career, he has taught at Oxford University, Cambridge University, the University of Chicago and the London School of Economics. Andre Beteille is one of India’s leading sociologists and writers. He is particularly known for his studies of the caste system in South India. He has authored many books. In the words of historian Ramchandra Guha, Beteille has written insightfully about all the major questions of the day: India’s encounters with the West, the contest between religion and secularism, the relationship between caste and class, the links between poverty and inequality, the nurturing of public institutions, the role and responsibilities of the intellectual, etc. He also worked on backward classes and their position in Indian society based on Smut’s lectures given in Cambridge in 1985. Theoretical Perspective: Beteille’s critical contribution has been contextualizing local concepts and understandings, such as caste and class, hierarchy and equality, and in more universal and generalized theories of inequality, stratification and justice. His works draw upon universal categories and concepts. He always places them in the context of empirical ground realities. Beteille closeness to Weber naturally also signalled his distance from Marx – a scholar whom he respected but from afar. He is the best known scholar in India on liberal theory and its application in social policy. Aware as he is, of the difficulties and limitations of the comparative method, he still manages to use it effectively. Beteille uses Weberian categories and mode of analysis. Thus, he refines the conceptualization of ‘ideas and interests’, and analyses the similarities and interdependence

of tribe and caste through intermediary category of the 'peasant'. He uses gender and its implication for 'blood' and hereditary to make an incisive comparison of race and caste. **Civil Society:** Beteille's writings on civil society convey the clear impression that if India can realize citizenship substantially by pressing on with the potentialities within liberal democracy, then that alone would be worthy of many a revolution. In the section on civil society and institutional wellbeing' he contextualizes secularism in an understanding of the 'citizen' and 'civil society' and urges the autonomy of public institution. In the section dealing with 'stratification in India', Beteille explores the dynamics of class, status and political mobilization. Here, he does not accept Marx's economic reductionism, even as he unmasks the ideological totalities of Louis Dumont's structuralism. Dipankar Gupta (2011) analyses the different meanings of the concept of 'civil society' in the West and in India. He identifies two major strands in this debate in India. One seeks to 'valorize' tradition against an oppressive and homogenizing state. The other represented by Beteille seeks instead to nurture modern institutions intermediate between the individual and the state, such as universities, hospitals and law courts. Beteille's is a lonely voice against the neo rationalists, engaged not in a hopeless harking back to the past but in securing the autonomy from the state and sectarian politics of intermediate institutions. Gupta suggests that in this otherwise laudable task Beteille has committed the error of ignoring the necessary functions of the democratic state. The exclusive focus on intermediate institutions lets the state off the hook, so to say, allowing it to abdicate its role in creating the conditions for effective citizenship.

Antinomies of Society: This collection on 'Antinomies of Society: Essays on Ideologies and Institutions' brings together some of the Beteille's recent works on institutions, civil society and democracy – all viewed in a comparative perspective but with India at the center of attention. The essays in this volume are devoted to changing norms and values with special emphasis on the tensions, oppositions and contradictions inherent in them. In exploring various facets of contemporary social and political life, Beteille reveals the stresses and strains of democracy in India and the difficulties of transforming a hierarchical society into an egalitarian one. In so doing, he exposes the disjunction between political ideals and social constraints. These and other antinomies are discussed in a set of essays that focus on a range of ideologies and institutions. Marxism, nationalism and secularism are among the ideologies discussed, along with the university, the civil service and other major institutions.

Caste: Several scholars have considered Indian society as "caste society". In his study, Beteille also emphasizes the caste structure of the Sripuram village of Tanjore district which was traditionally very complex and conservative district. The whole village is divided into

different castes comprising three main segments, namely, Brahmins, non Brahmins and AdiDravids (Untouchables). Caste system is a continuous process and is identifiable too. It enjoys both legal and religious sanctions in traditional Indian society. Different castes are assigned different roles, not only in economic matters, but over a wide range of social phenomena. In traditional society, punishment differs not only according to the nature of the offence committed, but also according to the caste of the offender. Beteille has outlined the basic features of the “caste” model of Indian society while examining its usefulness as a scheme of analysis. Class: Classes, in contrast, are de facto categories. Classes are in principle and, to some extent, in practice open; castes are not open. Classes do not enjoy the kind of legal and religious sanctions which were associated with castes (or, for that matter, with estates in feudal society). It is true that inequalities before law, which were associated with the different castes, have been completely removed, or almost so, in course of the last hundred years. Nonetheless, old habits of mind, conditioned by a legal and religious structure which for centuries upheld these inequalities, continue to play a part in the relations between castes in contemporary society. Social classes, defined in terms of ownership or non ownership of the means of production, tend to be reduced to a few broad divisions. In the context of the agrarian social structure of Sripurum classes are hierarchically arranged social categories, based broadly upon ownership or nonownership the means of production. Classes are subdivided in terms of (i) the types of ownership and control, and (ii) the types of services contributed to the process of production. Thus, a distinction is made between sharecroppers and agricultural labourers. Further, rentiers, farmers, cultivators, sharecroppers and agricultural labourers constitute distinct categories only at the conceptual level. They do not, in reality, comprise discrete groups, since it is frequently found that a single person is a rentier and a farmer, a sharecropper and an agricultural labourer.

The Idea of Equality and Inequality:

Beteille’s interest reflects in equality and inequality in human societies in his book entitled *The Idea of Natural Inequality and Other Essays* (1983). After the publication of this book he pursued work on caste in larger context than one village which appeared as *Castes: Old and New* (1969) and moved on to study class through agrarian relations and only after that to the more general theme of inequality. The essays in this volume examine various aspects of inequality with special reference to contemporary India but viewed in a comparative perspective. They deal with different forms and dimensions of inequality and with alternative

conception of equality. The work as a whole seeks to combine social analysis with social criticism, directing the critical approach to traditional hierarchical orders as well as modern systems of inequality generated by the market and the state. It is part of an effort to develop a common language in which the sociologist can address himself not only to his fellow sociologists, but also to other social scientists as well as the general reader. Some of the essays deal with equality and hierarchy as alternative designs for society while other focus on specific domains of society such as the legal order or the educational system. The essays are all based on lectures delivered in universities and other institutions of higher learning in places as far apart as Bombay, Cambridge, Sydney and London.

Society and Politics in India:

Like his first work, *Caste, Class and Power*, this latest book is rooted in the ethnography of the present. The volume on *Society and Politics in India: Essays in a Comparative Perspective* (1991) brings together some of the most important essays written over the past two decades by Beteille. He focuses upon the relationship between various forms of inequality and distinction (race, caste, tribe, ethnicity and gender) and on the relationship between the values of equality and individualism; and on the ambivalent role of the modern Indian state as the guarantor of these values. Beteille displays his command of the history of modern thought. However, he does not neglect theory or comparison. These essays seek our connections between seemingly disparate elements of public life. They examine the agenda that India set for itself at independence and the many social and cultural obstacles that still stand. The essays brought together in this collection were written or published between 1964 and 1990. Society and politics are subjects of continuous and animated discussion in contemporary India. The essays presented in this volume have the extensive use of the comparative method. Beteille also tried to make use of the concept of social structure. The volume consists of ten essays besides an introduction. The first two essays deal with race and caste, but not quite the same way. They are both comparative in outlook: 'race, caste and gender' being more self consciously so than 'race, caste and ethnic identity'. Both can be deepened by a consideration of gender and its place in societies divided by race or by caste. Both are also about collective identities. Similarly, in the essay on 'The Concept of Tribe', Beteille examines the special significance of collective identities in the social morphology of India – past and present. 'Caste and Politics in Tamilnadu' is an attempt to interpret regional political processes in the light of fieldwork experience. 'The Politics of "Non antagonistic Strata"' sought to challenge the view that castes ceased to be castes when they organized

themselves for competitive politics. The essay, 'Networks in Indian Social Structure' examines the limitations of a morphological approach wherein attention was confined exclusively to enduring groups and relations between them. Furthermore, two essays included in this selection on the backward classes reflect vast literature on the subject – descriptive, analytical and prescriptive. These essays deal with the issues of social stratification and social mobility respectively. The approach is directly sociological showing in particular the influence of Max Weber. The last two essays deal more with ideas, beliefs and values than social structure in the morphological sense. Equality is more an ideal than a fact; or rather, it is a social fact in so far as it is collectively acknowledged as an ideal and a value. In the last, Beteille writes: "I end as I began with the plea for a differentiated view of each and every society as a basis for the comparisons and contrasts we make between them."

Backward Classes in Contemporary India:

The Backward Classes in Contemporary India (1992) is a set of essays on the backward classes in contemporary India by Beteille who has devoted thirty years to the study of the subject. The essays written for scholars as well as laypersons deal primarily with the issues of public policy and, as such, have topical value in view of the importance assumed by the problem of reservations. Beteille begins with a critique of the equality provisions in the Constitution of India. He argues that the problem is not simply that of the contradiction between the principle of the equality and the practice of inequality, but also of the tensions between divergent concepts of equality. He deals in particular with the problem of balancing the principle of equal opportunities with the principle of redress. The discussion dwells on the disparities between groups that were such a striking feature of traditional India. An analysis of the structure of Indian society shows that the social situation of the SCs/STs has been and continues to be markedly different from that of the OBCs, which means that measures to redress that are appropriate to the former are not appropriate to the latter. The author argues that reservations in education and employment should be treated as matters of policy and not of rights. In our society, the individual, and not the caste or the community, is the fundamental bearer of rights and capacities. If caste quotas are treated as matters of right and extended indefinitely, there will be irreparable damage to institutions such as universities, hospitals and banks which are governed by principles that are radically different from those governing the relations between castes

Ideology and Social Science:

Ramachandra Guha, one of the pioneers of sociological studies in India said, '(Amartya) Sen has recently given us *The Argumentative Indian*; and now, in your hands, is (Andre) Beteille's equally compelling collection of essays on Indian ideas, themes and debates.' Andre Beteille has, over the past four decades, contributed a series of topical and stimulating articles to various newspapers. Some of these articles were collected in the book *Chronicles of Our Time*, published a few years ago. *Ideology and Social Science* is a new and rivetting collection of Beteille's writings on Indian society, politics and culture. The fifty articles in this book cover a very wide range of subjects: from the practice of sociology to the prospects of political liberalism, from contemporary debates about caste and caste quotas to old and still persisting myths about what is said to constitute the essence of Indian culture. Beteille's ambit includes the relevant and important themes of secularism, diversity and unity in cultures, the culture of tolerance, discrimination at work, value systems in the changing Indian family, and caste practices in village communities. Steering clear of passing intellectual trends as well as partisan politics, Beteille reaches his conclusions based on a careful examination of the evidence, not on a search for facts that fit a preconceived theory. Through his writings, he makes a cogent and passionate appeal to separate sociological theory from the frameworks of social activism. For students of sociology as well as the general reader, this is a book that will stimulate thought and generate interest in social and political issues that are at the core of India's modernity and tradition.

2. M. N. Shrinivas – Caste and Caste Systems Social Stratification.

Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas (1916-1999) was a world renowned Indian sociologist. He is mostly known for his work on caste and caste systems, social stratification and Sanskritisation in southern India. Srinivas' contribution to the disciplines of sociology and social anthropology and to public life in India was unique. It was his capacity to break out of the strong mould in which (the mostly North American university oriented) area studies had been shaped after the end of the Second World War on the one hand, and to experiment with the disciplinary grounding of social anthropology and sociology on the other, which marked his originality as a social scientist. It may be important to point out that it was the conjuncture between Sanskrit scholarship and the strategic concerns of the Western bloc in the

aftermath of the Second World War which had largely shaped South Asian area studies in the United States. During the colonial era, the Brahmins or Pandits were acknowledged as important interlocutors of Hindu laws and customs to the British colonial administration. The colonial assumptions about an unchanging Indian society led to the curious assemblage of Sanskrit studies with contemporary issues in most South Asian departments in the U.S. and elsewhere. It was strongly believed that an Indian sociology must lie at the conjunction of Indology and sociology. Srinivas' scholarship was to challenge that dominant paradigm for understanding Indian society and would in the process, usher newer intellectual frameworks for understanding Hindu society. His views on the importance of caste in the electoral processes in India are well known. While some have interpreted this to attest to the enduring structural principles of social stratification of Indian society, for Srinivas these symbolized the dynamic changes that were taking place as democracy spread and electoral politics became a resource in the local world of village society. By inclination he was not given to utopian constructions his ideas about justice, equality and eradication of poverty were rooted in his experiences on the ground. His integrity in the face of demands that his sociology should take into account the new and radical aspirations was one of the most moving aspects of his writing. Through use of terms such as "sanskritisation", "dominant caste", "vertical (intercaste) and horizontal (intracaste) solidarities", Srinivas sought to capture the fluid and dynamic essence of caste as a social institution. As part of his methodological practice, Srinivas strongly advocated ethnographic research based on fieldwork, but his concept of fieldwork was tied to the notion of locally bounded sites. Thus some of his best papers, such as the paper on dominant caste and one on a joint family dispute, were largely inspired from his direct participation (and as a participant observer) in rural life in south India. He wrote several papers on the themes of national integration, issues of gender, new technologies, etc. It is really surprising as to why he did not theorize on the methodological implications of writing on these issues which go beyond the village and its institutions. His methodology and findings have been used and emulated by successive researchers who have studied caste in India.

3. Gail Omvedt anticaste movements environmental movements farmer's and women's movements.

Dr. Gail Omvedt is an American born Indian scholar, sociologist and human rights activist. Omvedt has been involved in Dalit and anticaste movements, environmental, farmers' and women's movements. Omvedt posits that Hindutva groups foster an ethnic

definition of Hinduism based on geography, ancestry and heritage in order to create a solidarity amongst various castes, despite the prevalence of castebased discrimination. Omvedt endorsed the stand taken by Dalit activists at the 2001 World Conference Against Racism that caste discrimination is similar to racism in regarding discriminated groups as "biologically inferior and socially dangerous." Omvedt's dissertation was on Cultural Revolt in a Society: The NonBrahman Movement in Western India, 1873-1930. Omvedt's academic writing includes numerous books and articles on class, caste and gender issues, most notably. She has worked actively with social movements in India, including the Dalit and anticaste movements, environmental movements, farmers' movements and especially with rural women. She has been active in [Shramik Mukti Dal](#), [Stri Mukti Sangarsh Chalval](#) which works on issues of abandoned women in Sangli and Satara districts of southern Maharashtra, and the [Shetkari Mahila Aghadi](#), which works on issues of women's land rights and political power. Omvedt is critical of the religious scriptures of Hinduism (or what she specifically regards as "brahminism") for what she argues is their promotion of a castebased society. In addition to her criticism of their purported advocacy for the castesystem, Omvedt has also dismissed the Hindu tradition of venerating the Vedas as holy. In a 2000 open letter published in [The Hindu](#) addressed to then [BJP](#) President Bangaru Laxman, Omvedt gives her perspective on the Rigveda: As for the Vedas, they are impressive books, especially the Rg Veda. I can only say this only from translations, but I am glad that the ban on women and shudras reading them has been broken, and that good translations by women and shudras themselves are available. But to take them as something holy? Read them for yourself! Most of the hymns are for success in war, cattlestealing, lovemaking and the like. They celebrate conquest; the hymns about Indra and Vrtra sound suspiciously as if the Aryans were responsible for smashing dams built by the Indus valley people; though archeologists tell us there is no evidence for direct destruction by "Aryan invasion", the Rg Veda gives evidence of enmity between the Aryans and those they called dasyus, panis and the like Omvedt posits that Hindutva groups foster an ethnic definition of Hinduism based on geography, ancestry and heritage in order to create a solidarity amongst various castes, despite the prevalence of caste based discrimination. Omvedt endorsed the stand taken by Dalit activists at the 2001 World Conference Against Racism that caste discrimination is similar to racism in regarding discriminated groups as "biologically inferior and socially dangerous". She has called the United States a "racist country" and has advocated for affirmative action; however, she compares American positive discrimination policies favorably to those of India, stating: It is a sad comment on the state of Indian industrialists' social consciousness that such discussions

have begun in an organised way in the U.S. before they have been thought of in India itself and, with respect to perceptions of "group performance", in the United States and India, Omvedt writes; Whereas the U.S. debate assumes an overall equal distribution of capacity among social groups, in India the assumption seems to be that the unequal showing of different caste groups on examinations, in education, etc. is a result of actual different capacities.

5. Ashish Nandey Culture of Knowledge – Psychology of violence.

As his Nandy, sociologist and clinical psychologist, has over the years strayed into areas outside formal social sciences and normal academic concerns. His research interests center on the political psychology of violence, cultures of knowledge, utopias and visions, human potentialities, and futures. Presently he is working on genocide. The running themes in his work have been concern and respect for marginalized categories and systems of knowledge and a robust scepticism towards expert driven, packaged, professional solutions to human problems.

Module 05

Social Dominance Theory

1. Psychology of Dominance –Circulation of Oppression- Oppression and Cooperation.
2. Theoretical and practical issues of psychological Dominance in Indian Context.

1. Psychology of Dominance – Circulation of Oppression – oppression and Cooperation.

Introduction:

Social dominance theory (SDT) is a theory of intergroup relations that focuses on the maintenance and stability of group based social hierarchies. According to the theory, group based inequalities are maintained through three primary intergroup behaviours— specifically institutional discrimination, aggregated individual discrimination, and behavioral asymmetry. SDT proposes that widely shared cultural ideologies (i.e., legitimizing myths) provide the moral and intellectual justification for these intergroup behaviors. Social Dominance Theory was first formulated by psychology professors Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto. The theory begins with the observation that human social groups tend to be organized according to group based social hierarchies in societies that produce economic surplus. These hierarchies have a trimorphic (3form) structure. This means that these hierarchies are based on (1) age (i.e., adults have more power and higher status than children), (2) sex (i.e., men have more power and higher status than women), and (3) arbitrary set, which are group based hierarchies that are culturally defined and do not necessarily exist in all societies. Arbitrary set hierarchies can be based on ethnicity (e.g., Whites over Blacks in the U.S.), religion, nationality, and so on. Human social hierarchies consist of a hegemonic group at the top and negative reference groups at the bottom. More powerful social roles are increasingly likely to be occupied by a hegemonic group member (for example, an older white male). Males are more dominant than females, and they possess more political power (the iron law of andrarchy). Most high status positions are held by males. Prejudiced beliefs, such as racism, sexism, nationalism and classism, are all manifestations of this same system of social hierarchy.

Psychology of Dominance :

Dominance is a characteristic of highly social animals, such as humans, in which individuals of the same species compete intensely with one another for food, mates, territory, or any other resource, including money. In highly social species, individuals establish social

relationships with their family members, sexual partners, friends and enemies, and co-workers and competitors. A social relationship exists when two individuals interact repeatedly over time, they remember their past interactions and have expectations about their future ones. Social relationships can be strong or weak good or bad. A problem common to all relationships, no matter how strong or good they are, is one of conflicting interests—individuals want to act in ways that benefit themselves at the expense of their partner. Individuals with close social relationships interact regularly, and their interests clash multiple times a day. The easiest way for two individuals to resolve a disagreement would be to have a fight. The winner gets what he wants and the loser, well, loses. Disagreements between two parties can also be solved by negotiation leading to compromise. The problem is that these ways of settling disagreements can be very costly and are not always effective. Fighting can cause significant damage (both physical and psychological) to the parties involved and to their relationship—possibly leading to its dissolution—while negotiation can entail significant costs in time, energy, and cognitive and emotional resources (for example, constant worrying and rumination). Continuous fighting or negotiation also makes relationships unstable and stressful. Mother nature has found a better solution to the problem of settling disagreements: dominance. Two individuals in a relationship establish dominance with each other so that every time a disagreement arises, there is no need for fighting or negotiation. The outcome is always known in advance because it's always the same: the dominant individual gets what he wants and the subordinate doesn't. All that is needed when a disagreement occurs is some communication between the dominant and the subordinate: the dominant says to the subordinate "We are doing this My Way" with a threatening look and tone of voice; and the subordinate smiles submissively and says "Okay!" There is no risk of injury, and no waste of time or energy or cognitive or emotional resources. The relationship is stable and predictable, which is good for mental health, and both partners can accomplish whatever joint goals they have. Dominance doesn't exist because it's beneficial to the species, the community, or the family. Dominance is established within a relationship because it has a "net" benefit to each individual, which means that its benefits are greater than its costs. The benefits and costs of dominance, however, are different for the dominant and the subordinate. The benefits to the dominant are obvious: he gets what he wants. If there was a fight with the subordinate, the dominant would likely win the fight, but by resolving the disagreement through threats and submissive smiles instead of fighting, the dominant benefits by reducing the risk of injury. The costs of maintaining dominance include having to intimidate the subordinate every now and then to "remind" him of who is in charge, and some anxiety and

stress associated with the preoccupation that the subordinate may be plotting a rebellion. These costs are small when compared to the huge costs the subordinate has to pay: always letting the dominant get what he wants. But the subordinate benefits too. If there was a fight with the dominant, the subordinate would likely lose the fight. So not only would the subordinate not get what he wants, but by fighting he would also risk major injury and stress. By smiling submissively to the dominant instead of fighting, the subordinate benefits from reducing the risk of injury. So the advantage of establishing dominance to the subordinate is that he cuts his losses. Cutting one's losses? That's it? Yes, the truth is that subordination sucks, and I wouldn't recommend it to anyone. Behaving submissively to the dominant is advantageous to the subordinate only as a short term strategy, to give the subordinate some time to acquire more physical strength or political power to mount an effective rebellion against the dominant. For example, it's advantageous to a younger and smaller individual to be subordinate to an older and larger one until the former has grown to be as large as or larger than the latter. Then, a fight will become necessary and advantageous. If the subordinate never challenges the dominant, the costs of subordination would continue to accumulate over time and at some point, this would become a maladaptive strategy: the costs would be greater than the benefits. A dominant can do two things to keep the dominance relationship stable and prevent a rebellion from the subordinate. First, a dominant can use any means at his disposal to keep the subordinate from acquiring more power and to increase the potential costs of a rebellion (for example, by threatening the subordinate with violence against himself and his family members). This is the strategy used by dictators in despotic political regimes, and also by some domineering people in their personal relationships. Second, a dominant can increase the benefits to the subordinate by sharing some resources with him—by giving the subordinate a small piece of the pie or by giving the appearance that this is the case, that is by treating the subordinate nicely and making him think that his predicament is not so bad after all. This is what benevolent or manipulative leaders do in democratic societies, or in their personal relationships. Bottom line: dominance between two individuals helps keep the peace and increases stability and predictability in the relationship, thereby allowing both partners to benefit from their relationship. Dominance, however, is a better deal for the dominant than for the subordinate because the latter pays disproportionately the price for the peace. If one is in a weak position and unlikely to win a fight against a more formidable opponent it's okay to be subordinate but only for a short time and if this time is used to increase one's strength or power. Patience is a virtue for a subordinate, but resignation is the kiss of death.

Social Dominance Theory (SDT; e.g., Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) is an attempt to combine social psychological theories of intergroup relations with wider social process of ideology and the legitimization of social inequalities. SDT begins with the premise that most societies contain status hierarchies, with some groups systematically privileged over other groups. Thus, SDT has been used to explain the persistent inequalities of groups based on gender, race, and other marginalized social categories. SDT is a theory of social and intergroup relations that focuses on how people develop hierarchy supporting belief structures as a support for institutional dominance. It involves studies of who is likely to hold such attitudes, how they come to do so, and what are the ramifications for thought and action. According to SDT, a combination of political conservatism, prejudice, a belief in meritocracy, and the assumption of the inferiority of marginalized groups leads to the formations of persistent ideological myths, which Sidanius and Pratto (1999) term “legitimizing myths.” These myths become codified and institutionalized and serve to convince people that existing structures of inequality are just and desirable, despite their unequal outcomes with respect to low status groups. The focus on the social psychological processes by which ideological structures become internalized in individual attitudes and beliefs distinguishes SDT from other theories of ideology and makes SDT more amenable to psychological research (e.g., Huddy, 2004). Although such beliefs benefit highstatus members, their internalization by lowstatus groups also serves to prevent such groups from engaging in social action to prevent prejudice and inequality. SDT also assumes that all members of society are not equally socialized into hierarchical attitudes (Kravitz, 2004); this individual variability makes possible research into the sources of individual variance in adoption of legitimating beliefs, as well as into the impacts of such beliefs on individual and social processes. The “psychological” aspect of SDT is found in the individual difference variable social dominance orientation (SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius, Pratto & Mitchell, 1994), which reflects the degree to which dominance-maintaining social institutions color personal beliefs about intergroup relations. Sidanius, Pratto and Mitchell (1994) summarize SDO as an individual tendency to view groups in hierarchical terms and such that people high in SDO will support social policies promoting the social stratification of groups. Subsequent research supports the claim that SDO is positively related to negative attitudes toward low status groups and is correlated with sexism and ethnic prejudice. Empirical findings have tended to support the link between SDO and the tendency to promote policies that disadvantage lowstatus groups (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, &

Malle, 1994). Pratto et al. found support for a relationship between SDO and support for punitive criminal policies, as well as support for war, opposition to civil rights, and programs to benefit disadvantaged groups, such as affirmative action. SDO has been linked with lowered cooperation and increased social distance from outgroup members (Sidanius, Pratto, & Mitchell, 1994), as well as to lower level for help for Outgroup members, offering help only in ways that reinforce previous status hierarchies (Halabi, Dovidio, & Nadler, 2008). Because SDO capitalizes on previous psychological motives for ingroup enhancement, using legitimizing myths to justify motivated positive selfviews, One would expect highstatus groups to score higher on SDO than lowstatus groups. Indeed, empirical research has confirmed that social position does correlate positively with SDO; for example, men tend to score higher than women (e.g., Pratto et al., 2000), although such results may vary across cultures. However, lowstatus group members can also exhibit SDO, leading to counteringroup attitudes. Some research shows that while highstatus members increase ingroup favoritism when high in SDO, lowstatus member increase outgroup favoritism, meaning that their high SDO leads them to disfavor their own group (e.g., Jost & Burgess, 2000). Jost and Burgess(2000), for example, found that women high in SDO were more ambivalent with regard to women victims of discrimination, suggesting that their ingroup Supportive attitudes were being counteracted by their beliefs in the lowstatus of their group. In light of this, although SDT attempts to bridge psychological and social perspectives on the legitimation of dominance, it has natural affinities with concepts from critical theory such as hegemony and ideology. One criticism of SDT, therefore, might be that, despite these affinities, little cross disciplinary work has been done to create dialogue between these two perspectives, perhaps due to underlying methodological differences (SDT remains largely quantitative, reflecting a tradition of positivistic psychology less central to critical theory). Similarly, by discussing dominance structures primarily as questions of the reproduction of belief, critical scholars might fault SDT as overly “psychologizing” social and structural systems of oppression. Indeed, SDT does not deny structural factors, and actively engages the question of how these structures become internalized by actors. Yet, the conditions under which such structures can be shifted, resisted, or modified by individual actors remains an open area of research around SDT.

2. Theoretical and practical issues of Psychological Dominance in Indian Context.

India is famous for its complex social systems. Indian society has been divided into several Jaati and Upjaati (castes and subcastes)

and imposed an unjust, oppressive and draconian code of conduct and functions by discriminatory cast system on individual especially on a particular community in which it is decided that these people or society should do specific work. During 18th and 19th century various social reformers like Saint Kabir, Jyotiba Phule, Shahu Maharaj, Dr. Ambedkar, Mohandas Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, have fight for equality and establish modern and secular India. However, each social reformers and their thoughts become confined in each caste group. The new generation is forgetting the contributions of these reformers. Day by day, communal forces are becoming strong. It is quite necessary to stop social dominance orientation from different social groups. Indian society has been divided into several Jaati (castes) and Upjaati (sub castes) and imposed an unjust, oppressive and draconian code of conduct and functions by discriminatory cast system on individual especially on specific community In India the caste system is a classification of people into four hierarchically ranked castes called varnas. They are classified according to occupation and determine access to wealth, power, and privilege. The Brahmans, usually priests and scholars, are at the top of this system. Next are the Kshatriyas, or political rulers and soldiers. They are followed by the Vaishyas or merchants, and the fourth are the Shudras, who are usually laborers, peasants, artisans, and servants. At the very bottom of the caste system are those

considered as untouchables? Caste is a closed social stratum that determines its member's prestige, occupation, and social relationships. In each caste, social relations between members of different castes are severely limited and formalized. In the caste system, upper castes compete for the services of the lower castes. Higher caste people exploit the lower castes. The attitude of the upper castes has always been to consolidate and maintain their high social status. Discrimination is an action that denies social participation or human rights to categories of people based on prejudice. This includes treatment of an individual or group based on their actual or perceived membership in a certain group or social category, "in a way that is worse than the way people are usually treated." It involves the group's initial reaction or interaction, influencing the individual's actual behaviour towards the group or the group leader, restricting members of one group from opportunities or privileges that are available to another group, leading to the exclusion of the individual or entities based on logical or irrational decision making. According to UNICEF and Human Rights watch, caste discrimination affects an estimated 250 million people worldwide. Discrimination based on caste, as perceived by UNICEF, is prevalent mainly in parts of Asia, (India, Bangladesh, Nepal, China, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Japan), Africa and others. As of 2011, there were 200 million Dalits or Scheduled Castes (formerly known as "untouchables") in India. More than

165 million people in India continue to be subject to discrimination, exploitation and violence simply because of their caste. In India's "hidden apartheid," untouchability relegates Dalits throughout the country to a lifetime of segregation and abuse. Castebased divisions continue to dominate in housing, marriage, employment and general social interaction—divisions that are reinforced through economic boycotts and physical violence. Social Dominance Theory was first formulated by psychology professors Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto. The theory begins with the observation that human social groups tend to be organized according to group based social hierarchies in societies that produce an economic surplus. These hierarchies have a tripartite (3form) structure. This means that these hierarchies are based on (1) age (i.e., adults have more power and higher status than children), (2) gender (i.e., men have more power and higher status than women), and (3) arbitrary set, which are group based hierarchies that are culturally defined and do not necessarily exist in all societies. Arbitrary set hierarchies can be based on ethnicity (e.g., Whites over Blacks in the U.S.), religion, nationality, and so on. Human social hierarchies consist of a hegemonic group at the top and negative reference groups at the bottom. More powerful social roles are increasingly likely to be occupied by a hegemonic group member (for example, an older white male). Males are more dominant than females, and they possess more political power. Most high status positions are held by males. Prejudiced beliefs, such as racism, sexism, nationalism, and classism, are all manifestations of this same system. People who are higher on Social Dominance Orientation tend to endorse hierarchy enhancing ideologies, and people who are lower on Social Dominance Orientation tend to endorse hierarchy attenuating ideologies. Social Dominance Theory finally proposes that the relative is counterbalancing of hierarchy enhancing and attenuating social forces stabilizes group based inequality. Communal violence is a form or structure of violence that is perpetrated across ethnic or communal lines, the violent parties feel solidarity for their respective groups, and victims are chosen based upon group membership. The term includes conflicts, riots and other forms of violence between communities of different castes, religious faith or ethnic origins. Communal violence is found in Africa, Europe, Americas, Asia, and Australia. The term was constructed by the British colonial authorities as it wrestled to manage violence between religious, ethnic and disparate groups in its colonies, particularly Africa and South Asia, in early 20th century. The Indian law defines communal violence as, "any act or series of acts, whether spontaneous or planned, resulting in injury or harm to the person and or property, knowingly directed against any person by virtue of his or her membership of any

religious or linguistic minority, in any State in the Union of India, or Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes within the meaning of clauses (24) and (25) of Article 366 of the Constitution of India". Communal violence, in different parts of the world, is alternatively referred to as ethnic violence, non state conflict, violent civil unrest, minorities' unrest, mass racial violence, inter communal violence and ethno religious violence. Caste discrimination, Social dominance, and communal violence are the destructive determinants for social development. If we have to keep integrated and united India. We have to eradicate these destructive determinants from our society. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar has spent his life infighting against the exploratory system in India. To annihilate the exploratory system he gave a message of 'To Learn, To Organize and To Fight' to his followers. After Indian independence, he wrote Indian constitution in such a way that it is based on liberty, equality, and fraternity that are the Buddhist principles. He was the architecture of Indian constitution. To ruin the exploratory system from Indian society he frames a law in which it is assumed that to practice discrimination is a legal offense. India is multicultural and multicasite system society and if Dr. Babasaheb did not include the principle of secularism India doesn't remain as an integral. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar has run several movements such as 'Chavadar Lake', 'Black Ram Temple Entry' and so on. He wrote several books, plenty of volumes of speeches had been published by the Indian government that gave continuous inspiration to youngsters in India to fight against the exploratory system. His thoughts, his movements, and his whole life path play a model role for today's Indian generation.

References

1. Aron, R. 1967. *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*. Volume 2, Penguin Books: London.
2. Durkheim, E. 1950. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. (translated by S.A. Solovay and J.H. Mueller and (Ed) E. G. Catlin),
3. Aron, Raymond 1970. *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*. Vols. 1 and
4. Penguin Books: London, (see the sections on Marx and Durkheim)
- Bottomore, Tom (Ed.) 1983. *Dictionary of Marxist Thought*. Blackwell: Oxford.
5. Giddens, Anthony 1978. *Durkheim*. Harvester Press: Hassocks
6. Bierstedt, Robert 1966. *Emile Durkheim*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson: London
7. Durkheim, E. 1964. *The Division of Labour in Society* (reprint).
8. Durkheim, E. 1950. *The Rules of Sociological Method* (translated by S.A. Solovay and J.H. Mueller and (Ed.) E.G. Catlin).
9. Durkheim, E. 1947. *Suicide — A Study in Sociology*, (translated by G. Simpson), Macmillan: New York
10. Durkheim, E. 1961. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Collier-Macmillan: New York
11. Durkheim, E. 1960. *Montesquieu and Rousseau: Precursors of Sociology*. University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor (Michigan)
12. Lipset and Bendix, 1966. *Class, Status and Power, Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective*. Second Edition. Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited: London.
13. Lukes, Steven 1973. *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work*. Allen Lane, The Penguin Press: London
14. Mill, J.S. 1879. *System of Logic*. (10th edition, 2 volumes) Longmans, Green: London
15. Nandan, Yash 1980. *Emile Durkheim: Contributions to L'Année Sociologique*. The Free Press. A Division of Macmillan Publishing Company: New York
16. Nisbet, R.A. 1974. *The Sociology of Emile Durkheim*. Oxford University Press: New York

17. Rex, John 1961. *Key Problems in Sociological Theory*. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London

18. Smelser, Neil J. 1976. *The Sociology of Economic Life*. Prentice Hall of India Limited: New Delhi

19. Smith, Adam 1921. *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Volume 1 and 2, G. Bell and Sons: London